

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Broadmoor Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

Broadmoor Elementary School

3401 NW 83RD ST, Miami, FL 33147

<http://broadmoor.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 Broadmoor Elementary, we believe we are shaping the future by providing an environment where all children can learn. Our team of professionals are committed to building hope, enabling opportunity, creating equity and providing access for all stakeholders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Broadmoor Elementary, we are shaping the future of one student at a time.

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
Lazo, Michael	Principal	<p>The principal will schedule and facilitate weekly leadership team meetings, ensure attendance of team members, ensure follow up of action steps, and allocate resources. In addition, he will ensure that academic policies and curriculum are followed by receiving feedback from the instructional team on collaborative planning sessions and status on coaching cycles/calendars. Shares information gathered from academic walk-throughs, and facilitates discussions based on collected data, both qualitative and quantitative to build teacher capacity and monitor student learning success. The principal provides updates via weekly briefings, Title I, and monthly region/district principal meetings. Finally, analyze school-wide data to create/update School Improvement Process.</p>
Galceran, Maritza	Assistant Principal	<p>The assistant principal reviews consensus, infrastructure, and implementation of MTSS/SST, shares information gathered from instructional walkthroughs on curriculum and teacher performance and receives feedback from the instructional team on collaborative planning sessions and status on coaching cycles/calendars. In addition, the assistant principal attends collaborative planning sessions and presents problem solving methods for all or any student behavior or academic struggles. Finally, she shares updates on PLST meetings/professional development opportunities and analyze school-wide data to create/update School Improvement Process.</p>
Quintero, Amparo	Instructional Coach	<p>The reading coach debriefs status of coaching cycles, instructional focus, and curriculum updates. Also, discusses progress on interventions and/ or any changes that must take place. Shares data on bi-weekly assessments, iReady time on task/ lessons passed, intervention progress monitoring and AR. Discusses collaborative planning attendance and development of rigorous standard-based lessons. In addition, she develops weekly coaching calendars, and problem solves curriculum deficiencies by creating site-based professional development aligned to student needs. Finally, analyze school-wide data to create/update School Improvement Process.</p>
Nazario, Deylin	Instructional Coach	<p>The math coach debriefs status of coaching cycles, instructional focus, and curriculum updates. Also, discusses progress on topic assessments and shares iReady time on task/ lessons passed data, Discusses collaborative planning attendance and development of rigorous standard-based lessons. In addition, she develops weekly coaching calendars, and problem solves curriculum deficiencies by creating site-based professional development aligned to student needs. Finally, analyze school-wide data to create/update School Improvement Process.</p>
Pinero, Janet	Instructional Coach	<p>The science coach debriefs status of coaching cycles, instructional focus, and curriculum updates. Also, discusses progress on topic assessments. Discusses collaborative planning attendance and development of rigorous standard-based lessons. In addition, she develops weekly coaching calendars, and problem solves curriculum deficiencies by creating site-based</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	----------------	---------------------------------

professional development aligned to student needs. Finally, analyze school-wide data to create/update School Improvement Process.

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.

Throughout the school year, teachers and stakeholders will have the opportunity to be involved in the process via faculty meetings, EESAC meetings, and various parent meetings that take place throughout the school year. Information gathered will be used during the SIP development process.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be effectively monitored for implementation during leadership team meetings and faculty meetings throughout the school year. This will specifically include walkthroughs, student progress monitoring during grade level data chats, and collaborative planning. This will be an ongoing process.

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	92%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B
	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	2017-18: 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	24	11	13	22	15	12	0	0	0	97	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	1	7	5	0	13	0	0	0	26	
Course failure in Math	0	6	4	2	1	15	0	0	0	28	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	98	67	67	0	0	0	232	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	73	39	65	0	0	0	177	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	29	47	108	164	124	109	0	0	0	581	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	25	51	41	0	0	0	118

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	1	1	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	3	8	15	18	14	0	0	0	58	
Course failure in Math	0	2	4	8	9	12	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	32	26	0	0	0	58	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	32	37	0	0	0	69	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	13	44	46	31	26	0	0	0	160	

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	1	3	9	15	12	19	0	0	0	59

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	17	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	3	8	15	18	14	0	0	0	58	
Course failure in Math	0	2	4	8	9	12	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	32	26	0	0	0	58	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	32	37	0	0	0	69	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	13	44	46	31	26	0	0	0	160	

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	1	3	9	15	12	19	0	0	0	59

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	17	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	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*	25	60	53	41	62	56	38		
ELA Learning Gains				66			33		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			39		
Math Achievement*	38	66	59	45	58	50	30		
Math Learning Gains				69			28		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				72			28		
Science Achievement*	27	58	54	42	64	59	21		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	57	63	59	55			41		

* 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	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	158
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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	449
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	39	Yes	1	
ELL	28	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	31	Yes	1	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	32	Yes	1	

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	49			
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	58			
HSP	56			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	55			

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	25			38			27					57
SWD	13			46							3	57
ELL	19			40			22				5	57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26			35							2	
HSP	25			39			23				5	56
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	28			37			31				5	51

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	41	66	59	45	69	72	42					55
SWD	19	64	64	29	65							53
ELL	38	67	62	47	71	71	45					55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48	76		55	73		40					
HSP	39	64	59	43	69	73	43					55
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	39	65	59	44	68	72	38					55

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	38	33	39	30	28	28	21					41
SWD	12	31		13	38							36
ELL	35	35	33	29	33	29	19					41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45	50		36	23		18					
HSP	37	29	27	29	29	25	22					42
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	38	32	35	30	27	28	21					41

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	26%	56%	-30%	54%	-28%
04	2023 - Spring	32%	58%	-26%	58%	-26%
03	2023 - Spring	8%	52%	-44%	50%	-42%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	20%	63%	-43%	59%	-39%
04	2023 - Spring	47%	64%	-17%	61%	-14%
05	2023 - Spring	31%	58%	-27%	55%	-24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	19%	50%	-31%	51%	-32%

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 with the lowest performance was in overall ELA Proficiency at 31%. The contributing factors to this low performance included: high number of ELL students (over 2 yrs.) that were not proficient readers and lack of content knowledge that existed within the grade level.

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 overall ELA Proficiency. In 2022, overall ELA proficiency was at 41% compared to 2023 ELA proficiency of 31%. That was a 10

point decline. The factors for this decline include the high number of ELL students (over 2 yrs.) that were not proficiency readers and lack of content knowledge that existed within the grade level.

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 state averages was overall ELA Proficiency. The factors that contributed to this gap include the high number of ELL students (over 2 yrs.) that were not proficient readers and lack of content knowledge that existed within the grade level. In 2022, our overall ELA proficiency was at 31%. The State of Florida average for ELA proficiency was 55%. There was a -24 point gap when comparing our school to the state.

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 in overall Math Proficiency in 4th and 5th Grade. 4th Grade Math proficiency in 2022 was at 58% and 5th Grade Math proficiency in 2022 was at 41%. Teachers conducted ongoing progress monitoring, analyzed and used the data to plan standard based lessons which contributed to mastery of benchmarks.

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

Student Attendance: this school year, we plan to implement incentives and/or school-wide activities that surround around Mondays and Fridays (the days that students are most absent). If our students do not attend school, they are not learning and not prepared for the future.

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

- 1- Performance in overall ELA (Proficiency, LG's, and L25)
- 2- Performance in overall Science (Proficiency)
- 3- Student Attendance
- 4- Reading Intervention

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

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

According to the 2022-2023 FAST data, students scored an overall ELA of 31%. Based on the data and contributing factors of high ELL student population and teacher lack of content knowledge that existed within the grade levels, we will implement Job-Embedded Professional Development (JEPD) focusing on ELA differentiation.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Job-Embedded Professional Development (JEPD), the overall ELA student proficiency scores will increase by 10 percentage points by June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Job-Embedded Professional Development (JEPD) will be monitored during collaborative planning through product reviews and sign in/out sheets. In addition, walkthroughs will take place to ensure that the best practices and strategies from JEPD are being infused within instructional practices.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amparo Quintero (aramos2@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Our school will focus on the evidence-based intervention of Job-Embedded Professional Development (JEPD). JEPD will be used to provide students with different avenues of learning in terms of acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability. Focusing on JEPD through Differentiated Instruction can ensure successful mastery of benchmarks through remediation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Job-Embedded Professional Development (JEPD) will ensure that every student educational need is reached regardless of differences in ability. Research demonstrates this method benefits a wide range of students.

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.

JEPD's will be provided to teachers on how to effectively pull data from I-Ready, progress monitoring, and OPMs in order to identify the specific needs of students and to provide them with the necessary resources

for differentiated instruction. During weekly collaborative planning meetings (08/17-09/29), teachers and coaches will meet to discuss differentiated instruction resources and best practices.

Person Responsible: Amparo Quintero (aramos2@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/17-9/29

JEPD's will be provided to select teachers and support staff that push-in within specific homeroom classes based on Progress Monitoring Assessments data for ELA. Push-In support will target ESE, L25, Bubble students with each selected class during core instruction. The process of this step is ongoing (08/17-09/29) as instructional adjustments will be made accordingly.

Person Responsible: Michael Lazo (pr0521@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17-9/29

During Collaborative Planning, JEPD's will be provided to teachers on how to effectively provide feedback via differentiated Instruction. Support through Teacher/Coach Collaboration will be provided to instructional staff as needed. This process of this step will be ongoing (08/17-09/29) as instructional adjustments will be made accordingly.

Person Responsible: Amparo Quintero (aramos2@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/17-09/29

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2022-2023 Statewide Science Assessment (SSA), students scored an overall of 25% proficiency. Based on the data and contributing factors of high ELL student population, we will implement scientific inquiry, use of science lab, and adding a science coach position. In addition, we will implement the Targeted Element of Science.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of science lab rotations, completion of mini labs and instructional support by the science coach, the overall science proficiency scores will increase by 20 percentage points by June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will include completion of mini labs, lab rotations and science journals. Science journals will be monitored during collaborative planning through product reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Janet Pinero (jpinero@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Our school will focus on the evidence-based intervention of Instructional Support/Coaching. This will allow for overall school improvement due to the science coach and teachers working together to set a measurable goal to improve instructional outcomes. Coaching Cycles focus on the identified goal and increases the achievement and engagement of every student by bringing out the best performance of every teacher. Coaches use both student-centered and teacher-centered methods to help teachers improve the decisions they make about their instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Within the target element of instructional support/ coaching, teachers will be assisted in effectively providing science instruction that includes the implementation of lab rotations, science journals, and use of on-grade-level resources. By exposing our students to real-world, tangible experiences during science, we expect them to make life-long connections that will benefit them into scoring proficient on the Statewide Science Assessment.

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.

Data from science topic assessments will be used to identify the specific needs of students and to provide them with the necessary resources for science instruction. During weekly Science collaborative planning meetings (08/17-09/29), teachers and coaches will meet to discuss resources and best practices.

Person Responsible: Janet Pinero (jpinero@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17-9/29

Feedback will be given to teachers as to the effectiveness of their science instruction. Support through Coach/Teacher Collaboration will be provided to instructional staff as needed. This process of this step will be ongoing (08/17-09/29) as instructional adjustments will be made accordingly.

Person Responsible: Janet Pinero (jpinero@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17-9/29

Instructional walkthroughs will be conducted by coaches and administration to monitor Standards-based Instruction. The process of this step is ongoing (8/17-9/29) as instructional adjustments will be made accordingly.

Person Responsible: Michael Lazo (pr0521@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17-9/29

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2022-2023 School Climate Survey, 41% of students had 11 or more absences throughout the school year. Compared to Tier 1 schools that had 39% of students with 11 or more absences, we had 6% of students that had more truancy concerns. This data indicates that there is a need to increase student attendance. In addition, we will be implementing the Targeted Element of Early Warning Systems.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement student attendance, our student truancy will decrease by 10 percentage points in the 2023-2024 Climate survey by June 2024. In order to assist, students will receive incentives by visiting the bee bucks store and monthly attendance ice cream parties.

Monitoring:

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

Our Attendance Review Committee (ARC) will host meetings that will identify early warning indicators of attendance trancies. The ARC committee will keep constant communication with teachers to monitor student attendance patterns. Because student attendance directly impacts student achievement, the leadership team will also review data to highlight direct correlation between performance and attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Lazo (pr0521@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 Positive Culture and Environment, we will focus on Rewards and Incentives, where the school's leadership team will create rewards and incentive programs for students with perfect attendance and students with improved attendance on a quarterly basis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We want to improve student attendance in our school by incentivizing them for both being consistently responsible by showing up to school and for putting effort to show up on a daily basis. Student attendance is directly correlated with student achievement. By improving student attendance, we hope that student learning success is positively impacted.

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.

During the window of 09/05- 10/13, administration will provide students with a positive attendance record, specifically pertaining to Mondays and Fridays, each month with an ice cream party.

Person Responsible: Michael Lazo (pr0521@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/05-10/13

During the window of 09/05-10/13, Administration will monitor effectiveness of reward system and its effect in reducing absences. Our school counselor, will also play an integral role in overseeing our Attendance Review Committee meetings to ensure that students are in school on a daily basis.

Person Responsible: Maritza Galceran (169555@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/05-10/13

During the window of 9/05 to ongoing, the school counselor will be meeting with our most truant students in small groups in order to offer strategies and support services that will encourage the overall improvement of student attendance.

Person Responsible: Michael Lazo (pr0521@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/05 to ongoing

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**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.

Due to the various levels of content knowledge and experience within our teachers, our school will implement the Targeted Element of Collaborative Planning. Weekly Collaborative Planning sessions will be utilized to align the standards to the instruction. Due to Reading Proficiency from 2022-2023 being at 31%, Math Proficiency from 2022-2023 being at 41%, and Science Proficiency from 2022-2023 being at 25%, we are including collaborative planning with such a high focus. The reading, math and science coach will ensure the use of high-yield instructional strategies is taking place, which will in return allow students to demonstrate on-grade level learning success on statewide assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement Collaborative Planning with fidelity, students will demonstrate a higher academic achievement through topic assessment and progress monitoring assessment scores. The process of this step is ongoing, but by the end of the 2023-2024 school year we should have progress.

Monitoring:

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

Collaborative planning will be monitored through data driven decision making. Administrators will create alternating weekly schedules to attend all collaborative planning sessions for reading, math, and science.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Lazo (pr0521@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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborative Planning improves collaboration among teachers and promotes learning, insights, data analysis, decision making, and constructive feedback that occur during professional discussions among teachers. Standards-Based lessons, units, materials, and resources are improved when teachers work on them collaboratively.

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.

During the window of 8/21-9/29, collaborative planning will be held weekly in the areas of Reading, and Mathematics in grades K-5 . Transformational coaches will meet with every grade level for planning and data discussion (Science coach will meet with 5th grade only). Teachers will use this moment to infuse resources and best practices that meet student needs and improve teaching and learning.

Person Responsible: Amparo Quintero (aramos2@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/21-9/29

During the window of 8/21-9/29, data from I-Ready, progress monitoring assessments, topic assessments and OPMs will be analyzed in grades K-5. It will be used to target individual student needs for planning purposes. As data is collected, Professional Development opportunities may arise in order to continue building teacher capacity.

Person Responsible: Amparo Quintero (aramos2@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/21-9/29

During the window of 8/21-9/29, both administrators will attend reading and math collaborative planning sessions for all grade levels. Doing so will allow administrators to seek specific target areas during walkthroughs and provide teachers with any clarification when needed.

Person Responsible: Amparo Quintero (aramos2@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/21-9/29

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).

NA

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

According to the 2022-2023 diagnostic assessment data, 62% of students in kindergarten through grade 2 were not on track to score on grade level.

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

According to the 2022-2023 statewide, standardized ELA assessment, 69% of students in grades 3-5 scored below a level 3.

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 the 2022-2023 FAST PM3 data, 38% of students in grades K-2 scored on-grade level. With the implementation of the Gradual Release of Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM), 45% of students in grade K-2 will score on-grade level on the 2023-2024 FAST PM3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

According to the 2022-2023 FAST PM3 data, 31% of students on grades 3-5 are proficient in ELA. With the implementation of the Gradual Release of Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM), 40% of students in grade 3-5 will score on-grade level on the 2023-2024 FAST PM3.

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.

1. Data will be discussed during Collaborative Planning sessions. Administration will participate during data chats to address and plan for student needs in ELA.
2. Coaches and administration will monitor implementation of reading interventions through walk-throughs and dissection of on-going progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Lazo, Michael, pr0521@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 ELA, our school will focus on the Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model (GRRM). The GRRM is distinguished by four phases: (I do) clear explanations and demonstrations of the instructional target, (We do) providing strategic guided practice and feedback, (They do) gradually releasing students to practice the new skill collaboratively, and (You do) eventually requiring students to demonstrate mastery of the learning target independently.

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 (GRRM) is a particular style of teaching which is a structured method of pedagogy framed around a process beginning with explicit instruction. Students are guided through the learning process with clear statements about the purpose and rationale for learning the new skill. It is expected that with the implementation of the GRRM, teachers will promote learning achievements within students, resulting in more students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the PM3 of the 2024 FAST assessment.

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 in all grade levels will be provided with a professional development session that will provide information on explicit instruction and the use the Gradual Release Model of Responsibilities (GRRM). Teachers will participate in hands-on activities that will provide them with strategies that will effectively build student understanding. In this model, instruction moves along a continuum from teacher activity and focus to learner activity and focus.	Quintero, Amparo, aramos2@dadeschools.net
Teachers in grades 3-5 will plan collaboratively with the guidance of the reading coach, implementing the GRRM strategies. This will take place by utilizing the DLTs and Pacing guide to develop instruction on a weekly basis.	Quintero, Amparo, aramos2@dadeschools.net
Teachers in grades 3-5 will undergo product reviews, which will occur periodically during collaborative planning. During the product reviews, the coach, in collaboration with teachers will look for the effective use of the GRRM in journals and in the Reading/ Writing Companion.	Quintero, Amparo, aramos2@dadeschools.net
Administrative Walkthroughs will take place to ensure that the four components of the GRRM are implemented effectively during instruction in grades K-2. Timely feedback will be provided by administration to the reading coach to further support teachers during collaborative planning.	Lazo, Michael, pr0521@dadeschools.net
The reading coach will provide teachers in grades K-2 with coaching support to effectively implement the GRRM during instruction. By observing teachers during instruction, the coach will identify those who need additional assistance in effectively using the GRRM and place them in CTC's to model the proper implementation of the strategy.	Quintero, Amparo, aramos2@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.

This information will be disseminated to all stakeholder in various forms. This includes a) Title I Parent Meeting, b) Open House, c) Monthly EESAC meetings, and d) Parent Academy meetings at school. Furthermore, additional information will be made available through our Community Involvement Specialist (CIS) in our Parent Resource Room and via our website: broadmoor.,dadeschools.net.

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 plans to build such relationships with parents and stakeholders by holding various events at the school house that will motivate these individuals to come out. Such examples include Open House, Coffee with the Principal, monthly Student of the Month events, and various assemblies at the end of every quarter.

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 plans to increase and improve student learning by focusing in various areas. These areas include providing various extended learning opportunities for all students throughout the year, focus on the implementation of Differentiated and small group instruction during ELA and Math with fidelity, and building capacity with all teachers during collaborative planning and the completion of Coach/Teacher Cycles.

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))

This plan is developed while reviewing all laws and procedures that make it acceptable to implement school-wide for this school year. In addition, we work closely with Food and Nutrition for healthy and delicious meals for students and provide additional assistance for parents via Project Upstart should there be any housing concerns that develop.

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))

Optional

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))

Optional

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).

Optional

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))

Optional

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))

Optional

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: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$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