

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Caribbean K 8 Center School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 11 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 25 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 25 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 29 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 31 |

Caribbean K 8 Center

11990 SW 200TH ST, Miami, FL 33177

<http://caribbean.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.

Caribbean K-8 Center will strive to develop each student to his/her fullest potential using a variety of educational and technical methods that promote intellectual curiosity, independent thinking, and problem solving capabilities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Caribbean K-8 Center will offer and instill academic skills to each student to promote life-long learning in order to achieve his or her greatest potential.

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 |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Serrano-Duran, Noemi | Principal | The principal's role is to set the goals and vision for the school and implement a plan for student and staff success. As the main instructional leader in the building, the principal sets the tone for all stakeholder investment in student success. The principal guides decision-making and engages various stakeholders in making decisions in order to work efficiently for the achievement of all students. |
| Bales, Clinton | Assistant Principal | Mr. Bales oversees multiple programs throughout the school year. Mr. Bales facilitates and plans leadership team meetings that benefit students, while assisting colleagues in their roles as figureheads to their grade levels/ departments. Mr. Bales provides for a safe and clean learning environment in his role as a supervisor to the security and custodial teams. Mr. Bales welcomes a climate of engaging, highly qualified teachers, positive support systems with a goal focused on student achievement. |
| MacDonald, Tracey | Instructional Coach | As an Instructional Coach, Ms. MacDonald oversees ELA (K-8), Civics, and Science (5 and 8). She collaborates with teachers on a weekly basis to determine the engagement strategies that will be utilized during lesson delivery for the benchmarks. In addition, she analyzes data and implements coaching cycles as determined by the administration. Currently, Ms. MacDonald is teaching 8th Grade LA and Reading. |
| Beceiro, Maydelin | Instructional Coach | As an Instructional Coach, Mrs, Beceiro oversees Math (K-8) and Science (k-4 and 6-7). She plans with teachers on a weekly basis as well as provide teacher support and provides coaching cycles as needed. The Coach also tracks and analyzes student data after assessments. Mrs. Beceiro currently teaches the 8th grade Foundations Class and is part of the School Leadership Team (SLT). |
| Thompson, Terry | Teacher, ESE | Mr. Thompson works closely with instructional staff to identify needs and assist with proper implementation of school goals. He works closely with administration to establish professional learning communities and monitor their effectiveness. Additionally, he works closely with data to continuously plan for student achievement. |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The process of involving stakeholders in the School Improvement Plan (SIP) development process is essential for creating a comprehensive and effective plan that addresses the diverse needs of the school community. Stakeholder involvement in the development of the SIP includes, meeting with the

SLT and staff members to outline the purpose of the SIP and identify Areas of Focus. School Climate survey results from students and parents are analyzed in order to gather information from a larger segment of stakeholders. ESSAC meetings are held to provide an opportunity for the integration and development of the SIP. The input from all stakeholders is used to shape the areas of focus, action plans, and strategies that will be part of the SIP.

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))

Designated staff members, including school administrators and instructional leaders, will review the collected data and meet regularly to assess whether the strategies outlined in the SIP are yielding the desired outcomes. The team will collaboratively analyze the data to understand what is working and what needs adjustment. If certain strategies are not producing the expected results, the school will conduct a thorough analysis to identify the underlying causes. The school will ensure that professional development opportunities for teachers and staff are available in order to provide the knowledge and skills needed to effectively implement the SIP's action plan. A comprehensive approach to monitoring and revising the SIP will assist the school in its efforts to increase student achievement and address the academic standards set by the state, particularly for those students who are facing the greatest achievement gap.

Demographic Data

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School PK-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 98% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B |

| | |
|--|------------|
| | 2017-18: B |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 18 | 23 | 15 | 17 | 20 | 17 | 12 | 17 | 13 | 152 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 15 | 5 | 39 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 19 | 9 | 10 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 65 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 13 | 7 | 11 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 68 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 28 | 31 | 26 | 52 | 29 | 191 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 23 | 32 | 23 | 30 | 22 | 153 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 17 | 38 | 37 | 34 | 32 | 45 | 40 | 71 | 42 | 356 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 19 | 10 | 25 | 25 | 31 | 23 | 39 | 21 | 194 |

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 | 8 | 14 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 34 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 11 |

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 | 17 | 23 | 16 | 14 | 12 | 16 | 19 | 20 | 22 | 159 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 53 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 24 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 24 | 22 | 19 | 30 | 106 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 15 | 31 | 28 | 31 | 120 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 3 | 12 | 4 | 17 | 18 | 11 | 12 | 2 | 79 | |

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 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 7 | 21 | 24 | 23 | 31 | 138 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 8 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 |

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 | 17 | 23 | 16 | 14 | 12 | 16 | 19 | 20 | 22 | 159 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 15 | 5 | 39 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 19 | 9 | 10 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 65 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 13 | 7 | 11 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 68 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 28 | 31 | 26 | 52 | 29 | 191 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 23 | 32 | 23 | 30 | 22 | 153 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 3 | 12 | 4 | 17 | 18 | 11 | 12 | 2 | 79 | |

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 | 19 | 10 | 25 | 25 | 31 | 23 | 39 | 21 | 194 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 8 | 14 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 34 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 11 |

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* | 49 | 61 | 53 | 43 | 62 | 55 | 40 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 53 | | | 43 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 45 | | | 52 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 47 | 63 | 55 | 47 | 51 | 42 | 30 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 68 | | | 35 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 72 | | | 42 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 28 | 56 | 52 | 32 | 60 | 54 | 33 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 72 | 77 | 68 | 84 | 68 | 59 | 73 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 76 | 75 | 70 | 75 | 61 | 51 | 74 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | 76 | 74 | | 53 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | 73 | 53 | | 78 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 60 | 62 | 55 | 60 | 75 | 70 | 63 | | |

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 55 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 387 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 58 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 579 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| 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 | 3 | |
| ELL | 51 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 59 | | | |
| 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 | 55 | | | |

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 | 39 | Yes | 2 | |
| ELL | 59 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | | | |
| HSP | 61 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 58 | | | |

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 | 49 | | | 47 | | | 28 | 72 | 76 | | | 60 |
| SWD | 26 | | | 29 | | | 25 | 33 | | | 6 | 64 |
| ELL | 44 | | | 49 | | | 5 | 71 | | | 6 | 60 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | | | 36 | | | 20 | 66 | | | 5 | |
| HSP | 54 | | | 55 | | | 29 | 74 | 77 | | 7 | 58 |
| 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 | 47 | | | 47 | | | 28 | 69 | 72 | | 7 | 68 |

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 | 43 | 53 | 45 | 47 | 68 | 72 | 32 | 84 | 75 | | | 60 |
| SWD | 21 | 39 | 37 | 32 | 70 | 64 | 12 | | | | | 38 |
| ELL | 44 | 60 | 57 | 51 | 65 | 76 | 33 | 81 | | | | 60 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 46 | 40 | 39 | 69 | 76 | 26 | 73 | | | | |
| HSP | 51 | 59 | 55 | 51 | 66 | 68 | 38 | 91 | 68 | | | 58 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 53 | 45 | 46 | 68 | 72 | 32 | 84 | 75 | | | 59 |

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 | 40 | 43 | 52 | 30 | 35 | 42 | 33 | 73 | 74 | | | 63 |
| SWD | 13 | 29 | 36 | 10 | 21 | 37 | 0 | | | | | 71 |
| ELL | 43 | 60 | 72 | 35 | 45 | 40 | 25 | 78 | | | | 63 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 24 | 30 | 38 | 17 | 29 | 41 | 15 | 61 | | | | |
| HSP | 51 | 53 | 70 | 39 | 40 | 44 | 41 | 81 | 72 | | | 64 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 40 | 43 | 51 | 29 | 34 | 41 | 32 | 69 | 71 | | | 63 |

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% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 27% | 50% | -23% | 47% | -20% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 51% | -5% | 47% | -1% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 39% | 58% | -19% | 58% | -19% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 45% | 50% | -5% | 47% | -2% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 43% | 52% | -9% | 50% | -7% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 35% | 58% | -23% | 54% | -19% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 31% | 48% | -17% | 48% | -17% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 51% | 63% | -12% | 59% | -8% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 64% | -18% | 61% | -15% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 61% | 59% | 2% | 55% | 6% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 39% | 58% | -19% | 55% | -16% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 26% | 40% | -14% | 44% | -18% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 24% | 50% | -26% | 51% | -27% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 77% | 56% | 21% | 50% | 27% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 56% | 68% | -12% | 66% | -10% |

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.

According to the 2022-2023 SSA data, 28% of 5th and 8th grade students were proficient in the 2023 State Science Assessment as compared to the state average of 48% and district average of 45%.

Based on the data and identified contributing factors there was a lack of rigorous science instruction in tested and non-tested grades with limited knowledge of student science vocabulary, we will implement the targeted element of instructional support coaching.

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

Civics went from 82% to 72%. There was a decrease of 10% points from the previous year. Due to class sizes, the teacher was not able to conduct small group (differentiated) instruction as in previous years.

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 Science 26% points.

- The students were not exposed to rigorous application questions and did not have opportunities to engage in hands-on experiments. Learning in the classroom was teacher-centered and not student-centered.
- School-wide science was not a priority in all grades.

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

ELA showed a 6%-point increase (43%-2022 to 49%-2023). The ELA teams focused on Vocabulary, Fluency, and Comprehension. During collaborative planning, teachers created questions using achievement level descriptors, B.E.S.T. standards, and various question stems from progress monitoring assessments.

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

After reflecting on the EWS data from Part 1, the area of concern is science. The following actions will be taken during the 2023-2024 school year, to ensure that all grade levels are teaching scientific concepts with in-depth studies through labs, STEM activities, and focus on science terminology (vocabulary). The

school will implement a monthly STEM Day with hands-on activities. The Literacy Coach will work with enrichment teachers to provide students with online Edusmart-focused lessons.

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

1. Science
2. Math
3. Civics
4. Algebra
5. Writing

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Based on the our data review, our school will focus on Culture & Environment, specifically relating to Student Attendance. Based on the 2022-2023 school-wide attendance data 30% of students were absent 16 or more times, as compared to the districts average of 29% of students with 16 or more absences, this is a difference of 1 percentage points. It is evident that there is a correlation between student overall attendance and deficiencies in students achievement levels.

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 and interventions we expect to see a decrease of 10 percentage points of students with 16 or more absences by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Homeroom teachers will monitor daily attendance and report students to the attendance committee that has excessive tardies and/or absences. Student absences will be monitored on a weekly basis and action steps to prevent excessive absences will be implemented with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Clinton Bales (cbales@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 intervention selected for implementation for this area of focus is Attendance Initiatives. Student absences will be closely monitored. When students are absent, parents will be called. Upon accumulating 5 absences, additional measures will be taken, including meetings, home visits, counseling, and referrals to outside agencies. There will also be incentives for students with perfect attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy was to created and maintain open communication with families, stressing the importance of attendance, and providing support as needed to ensure students are present in school. As a results of these interventions, student attendance should increase.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The Attendance Team, Mr. Clinton Bales, Mr. Thompson, Ms. Braithwaite, Ms. Mayhew, Ms. Diaz, and Ms. Reyes will develop and implement a school-wide attendance plan that specifically targets overall

attendance. Attendance initiatives will assist in decreasing the number of student absences. The rewards will provide students with an incentive to come to school daily. This will increase our overall attendance and as a result, we expect to see an increase in academic performance. Morning announcements will select students randomly that are present and on time.

Person Responsible: Clinton Bales (cbales@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 31, 2023

The team will create a visual display that will be showcased in each homeroom class. When the homeroom is 100% present, the class will color in one letter of the words "Perfect Attendance." Once the class completes the chart, the homeroom will receive a reward. Attendance rewards will provide students with an incentive to come to school daily. This will increase our overall attendance and as a result, we expect to see an increase in academic performance.

Person Responsible: Terry Thompson (terrythompson83@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 31, 2023

Daily monitoring of Student attendance. The Attendance Team, Mr. Clinton Bales, Mr. Thompson, Ms. Braithwaite, Ms. Mayhew, Ms. Diaz, and Ms. Reyes will make phone calls daily to contact parents about the student's absence. The team will keep a record via an Excel sheet documenting phone calls. The attendance team will meet weekly to identify students who have excessive absences and determine the next steps. Monitoring attendance on a daily basis and documenting students who have excessive absences will decrease the number of student absences.

Person Responsible: Clinton Bales (cbales@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 31, 2023

#2. 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.

Based on the data review, our school will implement the Targeted Element of Collaborative Planning. Our Math data for 2023 FAST PM3 was 51%, state 56% and district 59%. Although we increased in percentage points, we are still below the state and district average. A focus on Collaborative planning will allow teachers and the Instructional Coach to plan explicit and effective lessons to increase student proficiency in the Spring 2024 Math FAST PM3.

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 Planning, the teachers and Instructional Coach will meet weekly with fidelity to identify upcoming lessons to be taught and ensure instruction is aligned in order to increase student proficiency from 51% to 56% in the 2024 Spring Math FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Leadership team will meet weekly to discuss upcoming collaborative planning sessions. Additionally, administrative team will conduct walkthroughs to ensure there is alignment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Noemi Serrano-Duran (pr0661@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 Planning, our school will focus on data-driven decision-making as an evidence-based strategy. During planning, we will look into data (topic assessments, AP1 FAST 1, etc) to ensure planning is effective to meet the needs of our students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We will focus on data driven decision-making during planning to review individual student performance on topic assessments. Teachers will review data and create groups for DI. We will also identify resources to be used. This shift in data analysis will allow us to see an increase in proficiency during the 2024 Spring Math FAST PM3.

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.

Teachers will meet with Instructional Coach on a weekly basis to plan lessons that are aligned to benchmark. We will review BIG-M to identify misconceptions and identify resources to be used.

Person Responsible: Maydelin Beceiro (mbeceiro@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

Administration will conduct walk throughs to ensure there is alignment in lesson and explicit instruction in the lesson.

Person Responsible: Noemi Serrano-Duran (pr0661@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

Data chats with Instructional Coach and teacher will be conducted on a regular basis to track student performance and ensure effectiveness of lesson.

Person Responsible: Noemi Serrano-Duran (pr0661@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 2022-2023 SSA data, 28% of 5th and 8th grade students were proficient in the 2023 State Science Assessment as compared to the state average of 48% and district average of 45%.

Some of the contributing factors were a lack of rigorous science instruction in tested and non-tested grades and limited knowledge of student science vocabulary. The school will implement the targeted element of instructional support coaching, as well as Data-Driven Decision Making.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of instructional support coaching, an additional 10% (for a total of 38%) of 5th and 8th grade students will score at grade level or above in the area of science by the 2023-2024 state assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will conduct monthly data chats and follow up with walkthroughs to ensure rigorous science instruction is occurring through bell ringers, essential labs, lab write-ups, questioning techniques, vocabulary application, and student-centered learning. Administrators will review during journal checks and administrative walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tracey MacDonald (traceyannmacdonald@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 evidenced-based intervention being implemented for the area of focus is Data-Driven Decision Making which will be used to identify the benchmarks students need remediation. The instructional coach and teachers will use the science baseline, topic assessments, science midyear assessment, and essential labs to determine the weakest benchmarks and provide remediation opportunities for students using Edusmart, CPalms, and Edgenuity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is to ensure that the instruction for students is more aligned and customized to their specific needs. A focus on data-driven decision-making will allow teachers to focus on assessing student learning, analyzing assessment data, and adjusting instruction in response to the data and for teachers to be intentional with instruction to have students reach proficiency.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The instructional coach will meet with the science teachers on 09/11/23 to analyze science baseline data and identify the weakest benchmark(s).

Person Responsible: Tracey MacDonald (traceyannmacdonald@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 11, 2023

The instructional coach and science teachers will meet and collaborate on a weekly basis to identify instructional strategies, resources, and check for understanding opportunities that teachers will use to instruct and remediate benchmarks. This will be evidenced by teacher lesson plans and student interactive journals and notebooks.

Person Responsible: Tracey MacDonald (traceyannmacdonald@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

The administration will attend collaborative planning sessions and conduct walkthroughs in science classrooms to monitor the instructional delivery of the benchmarks and conduct product reviews of student interactive journals.

Person Responsible: Noemi Serrano-Duran (pr0661@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2022-2023 F.A.S.T proficiency data in the subgroup area of Students with Disabilities, 25% of students were proficient in ELA, 34% of students were proficient in Math, 25% of the students were proficient in Science, and 28% of the students were proficient in Civics. Based on this data, students with disabilities are scoring lower than their general education peers. The 2023-2024 school year will focus on increasing proficiency in the subgroup of Students with Disabilities by 5% points.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of student-centered learning, an additional 5% of our students with disabilities will score at grade level or above in the area of ELA, and an additional 7% in the area of Mathematics by the 2023-2024 FAST PM3 assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The school leadership team and special education teachers will meet on a monthly basis to analyze the progress of our SWD students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Noemi Serrano-Duran (pr0661@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 intervention being implemented for the Area of Focus will be to teach a set of academic vocabulary words intensively across several days using a variety of instructional activities. The State Standards for English Language Arts require that students acquire grade-appropriate general academic and domain-specific vocabulary and use these words accurately.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is that Vocabulary plays a fundamental role in the reading process and is critical to reading comprehension.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The instructional coach will collaborate weekly with the special education and general education teachers to discuss the strategies that will be used during instructional delivery to give students opportunities to learn academic vocabulary. The strategies will include both direct instruction and indirect vocabulary instruction methods.

Person Responsible: Tracey MacDonald (traceyannmacdonald@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

The instructional coach with the special education and general education teachers will analyze biweekly progress monitoring data to determine if the strategies being used are effective or if shifts need to be made during instruction.

Person Responsible: Tracey MacDonald (traceyannmacdonald@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

The administration will conduct walkthroughs to ensure that the strategies discussed during collaborative planning are being implemented during classroom instruction and evidenced in student work products.

Person Responsible: Noemi Serrano-Duran (pr0661@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The school will provide afterschool tutoring opportunities for students identified in the lowest 35 percentile in the areas of mathematics, reading, science, and civics. The teacher will use data-driven decision-making to determine the needs of students and provide them with remediation opportunities in the benchmarks that students performed the lowest based on topic and progress monitoring assessments.

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

Grades K-2: According to the 2023 STAR FAST PM3 Assessment 23% of students in grades K-2 were proficient in Reading. Based on this data, the instructional practice that will be used to increase proficiency by 10% (33%) in Reading/ ELA will be Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (DRTA).

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

Grades 3-5: According to the 2023 FAST PM3 Assessment 41% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in Reading (43% in grade 3, 39% in grade 4, and 40% in grade 5).

Based on this data, the instructional practice that will be used to increase proficiency by 10% (51%) in Reading/ ELA will be standards and skilled-aligned Anchor Charts.

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

After the implementation of the instructional practice of Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (DRTA) in the 2023-2024 school year, an additional 10% of our Kindergarten through Second Grade students will score at grade level or above in the area of Reading by the 2024 STAR F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring 3 assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

After the implementation of the instructional practice of Anchor Charts in the 2023-2024 school year, an additional 10% of our Third through Fifth Grade students will score at grade level or above in the area of Reading by the 2024 CAI F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring 3 assessment.

Monitoring**Monitoring**

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

The school's Area of focus (Directed Reading-Thinking Activity and Anchor Charts) will be monitored by the Administration, as well as the Instructional Reading Coach through collaborative planning and classroom walkthroughs. Based on this ongoing monitoring we expect an an increase of proficiency at the end of the year.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

MacDonald, Tracey, traceyannmacdonald@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?

K-2: The instructional practice of Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (DRTA) will improve reading comprehension by guiding students in asking questions about a text, making predictions, and then reading to confirm or refute their predictions. The DRTA process encourages students to be active and thoughtful readers, enhancing their comprehension.

3-5: The instructional practice of anchor charts will improve reading comprehension by keeping learning accessible to students, anchor charts remind students of prior learning, and enable them to make connections as new learning happens. Students can refer to them and use them as they think about the topic, question ideas, expand ideas, and/or contribute to discussions in class.

With the implementation and consistency of the instructional practices identified above, reading comprehension in the grade levels identified above should increase, therefore, increasing proficiency levels on the 2024 F.A.S.T. PM3.

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?

Both instructional practices that will be used in K-5 are evidence-based practices that are effective in reading comprehension, the rationales for these two practices are explained below.

K-2. Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) strategy is a reading skill that leads to the ability to understand information analytically, critically, and reflectively. The Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) strategy is a teacher strategy for students by engaging them intellectually and encouraging them to formulate questions and hypotheses, process information, and evaluate temporary solutions by encouraging them to provide predictions of a story and draw conclusions from the stories the teacher gives. Therefore, increasing the ability of the student to effectively comprehend the text.

3-5: Anchor charts are tools that support learning in the classroom, these visual prompts will provide students with information regarding their prior learning on a given topic, as well as scaffold learning to support the students during guided practice and independent work. Anchor charts "anchor student learning" by promoting critical thinking by asking students to make connections and supply evidence for inferences and conclusions. Therefore, increasing the ability of the student to effectively comprehend the text.

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 |
|---|---|
| <p>08/21-09/29</p> <p>K-2: The instructional coach and teachers will collaborate to identify strategies and routines for the teacher to use during their opening routines. Such strategies/ routines include the teachers directing and activating students' thinking prior to reading a passage by scanning the text features. The teacher will then use open-ended questions to direct students as they make predictions about the text using a sentence starter. "I predict... because..."</p> <p>3-5: The instructional coach and teachers will collaborate to identify anchor charts for the standards and skills for student resource journals. These journals will be kept by the student, the instructional coach will provide the teachers with the anchor charts that are discussed during weekly collaborative planning. The students will create a table of contents so that the student can refer back to the standards-based anchor chart to remind them of prior learning.</p> | <p>MacDonald, Tracey, traceyanmacdonald@dadeschools.net</p> |
| <p>08/21-09/29</p> <p>K-2: The instructional coach and teachers will identify pre-selected stopping points with questions about specific information and ask students to evaluate their predictions and refine them if necessary. This routine will continue until students have read the entire passage.</p> <p>3-5: The instructional coach and teachers will identify additional resources (such as learning videos, and thinking steps) for students to add to their resource journal.</p> | <p>MacDonald, Tracey, traceyanmacdonald@dadeschools.net</p> |
| <p>08/21-09/29</p> <p>K-2: The instructional coach and teachers will identify strategies and routines that the teacher will use after the students have read the text that will require the students to go back through the text and think about their predictions. Students should verify or modify their predictions by finding supporting evidence in the text. The teacher asks questions such as: What do you think about your predictions now?</p> <p>3-5: The instructional coach during collaborative planning will conduct product reviews to ensure resource journals with anchor charts and additional notes are serving as an artifact of classroom learning.</p> | <p>MacDonald, Tracey, traceyanmacdonald@dadeschools.net</p> |

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.

Effective dissemination of the school improvement plan (SIP) is crucial to ensure that all stakeholders, including teachers, students, parents, and community members, are aware of the plan's goals, strategies, and timelines. The SIP will be presented and shared during ESSAC meetings, during parent workshops and meetings hosted by the Community Involvement Specialist (CIS), and online platforms. Components of the the SIP such as the plan's progress and upcoming activities will be shared with staff, parents, and community members

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 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. This will be done via a multifaceted strategy that revolves around open communication, active engagement, and collaborative initiatives. The school will utilize clear communication channels and digital platforms such as, but not limited to Schoology, Class Dojo, the school website, and School Messenger. Regular parent-teacher conferences will be scheduled throughout the academic year to discuss each student's progress, strengths, and areas for improvement. The school will organize open house events at the beginning of the academic year, allowing parents and families to explore the school site, meet teachers, and understand the school's curriculum and expectations. Family-oriented events, such as STEM nights and Holiday Shows, will foster a sense of community involvement and pride. The school will celebrate and respect the cultural diversity within its student body by organizing events, festivals, and discussions that promote understanding and inclusivity among parents, students, and staff.

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)

In order to strengthen the academic program at the school and enhance the learning experience for students, the following strategies and initiatives are being implemented: The school is utilizing data to identify areas of improvement and areas of strength in the academic program. This data-driven approach allows educators to tailor interventions and enhancements based on real-time insights. The school is committed to ongoing professional development for teachers to enhance their instructional techniques and strategies.

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

The SIP is being developed in a strategic manner in order to align and support the Title I program. The SIP includes areas of focus to narrow the achievement gap and obtain proficiency, improve academic performance, and enhance educational opportunities for economically disadvantaged students. By addressing the specific needs of these students, the SIP ensures that Title I funds are utilized in a targeted and purposeful manner.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

The school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas by providing counseling opportunities by conducting monthly events and activities that are provided by the School Trust Counselor, School-Based Counselor, the Mental Health Coordinator through Children's Nicklaus partnership.

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

N/A

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

A school-wide tiered discipline plan has been implemented to prevent and address problem behavior,

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))

Instructional Coaches conduct Professional Development throughout the school year to ensure all teachers and school personnel are kept abreast of data trends and instructional practices. In addition, data chats are continuous throughout the school year to monitor instruction and make adjustments as needed so we can track student achievement.

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

The school assists preschool children with the transition process from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs by having a meet-and-greet event for students and

parents. During this event, parents meet PK teachers and explain classroom expectations for the school year.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$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