

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Calusa Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Calusa Elementary School

9580 W CALUSA CLUB DR, Miami, FL 33186

<http://calusa.dadeschools.net/>

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The staff and community of Calusa Elementary School will provide students with sensitivity, awareness, and an understanding of our cultural diversity. Global perspectives will be addressed through an interdisciplinary approach to instruction. A meaningful learning environment will be provided to instill a feeling of mutual respect among teachers, students, and parents. The process will develop students to their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Calusa Elementary School enriches the community through: the conveyance of the cultural heritage of the nation and the surrounding community; the provision of the best possible educational experiences to our students; the extension of the services school to address the needs of the whole individual; and the provision of a center for community activities.

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
Hernandez, Suzet	Principal	The principal's role at the school is to provide strategic direction for teachers and staff and oversee the daily activities and operations within the school.
Reyes, Aixa	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is responsible for facilitating the day to day requirements of the school and ensuring the safety of the students.
Diaz, Ana	Instructional Media	The Media Specialist will implement a schoolwide reading incentive program as well as assist teachers with procuring resources to enhance their curriculum. She will also guide students in searching for information for educational purposes.
DeCespedes, Laura	ELL Compliance Specialist	The ELL Compliance Specialist will ensure that ELL students are accessing the curriculum as mandated by the District. She is also responsible for ELL testing and maintaining necessary records.
Flores, Sachee	Teacher, PreK	The VPK teacher is responsible for planning and implementing the daily program for our primary grade students.
Rodriguez, Gretel	Teacher, K-12	This teacher leader is responsible for ensuring that teachers are accessing necessary Reading resources and implementing strategies to ensure that students develop literacy skills. She assists teachers in evaluating their students' reading levels thus creating lesson plans that will encourage them to read and advance in proficiency.

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 is a crucial factor in the successful implementation of our School Improvement Plan. Our school leadership team meets monthly in order to ensure that instructional needs are being met and that action steps are being implemented. Teacher, staff and student input on school climate surveys are used to determine specific school culture needs. Additionally, our School Improvement Plan is addressed at every staff meeting and teachers are encouraged to provide input and suggestions. To allow for input from parents and community leaders, our School Improvement Plan is also presented and discussed during monthly EESAC and community PTA meetings.

SIP Monitoring

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

Our School Improvement Plan will be continuously addressed in order to ensure that our students and staff are on a path to success. Teachers will use periodic assessments to determine whether students are making progress and plan for remediation when necessary. Administrators will, individually, meet with teachers to ensure that all students, especially those in lower scoring subgroups are making appropriate progress. The Leadership

Team, with input from teachers, will revisit the School Improvement Plan on a quarterly basis to determine whether the plan needs revisions. If it is evident that our plan requires revision, we will seek input from staff in order to edit action steps in order to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	95%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	61%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	3	2	4	4	3	0	0	0	16	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	8	0	1	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	1	6	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	17	16	0	0	0	33	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	15	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	2	12	17	20	0	0	0	56	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	6	6	11	0	0	0	24

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	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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	3	6	4	6	3	0	0	0	22	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	3	5	1	2	2	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	4	0	0	0	18	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	13	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	5	6	15	6	0	0	0	37	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	3	0	7	4	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	3	2	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	16	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	5	5	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	1	6	5	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	16	11	0	0	0	44	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	9	10	0	0	0	25	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	2	12	17	20	14	0	0	0	70	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	6	6	11	11	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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*	77	60	53	86	62	56	84		
ELA Learning Gains				83			71		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				75			58		
Math Achievement*	85	66	59	88	58	50	75		
Math Learning Gains				74			60		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				66			41		
Science Achievement*	84	58	54	85	64	59	65		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	76	63	59	77			57		

** 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	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	402
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	634
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	57			
ELL	75			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	80			
HSP	81			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	88			
FRL	74			

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	53			
ELL	77			
AMI				
ASN	95			
BLK	85			
HSP	79			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	85			
FRL	77			

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	77			85			84					76
SWD	47			66			54				5	60
ELL	69			85			76				5	76
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	70			90							2	
HSP	78			84			86				5	76
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80			95			90				3	
FRL	69			78			79				5	69

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	86	83	75	88	74	66	85					77
SWD	56	60	56	59	47	38	56					53
ELL	77	74	71	86	79	77	77					77
AMI												
ASN	90			100								
BLK	70			100								
HSP	86	82	76	86	76	64	84					78
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	89	100		94	57							
FRL	83	78	73	85	72	67	82					77

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	84	71	58	75	60	41	65					57
SWD	54	68	54	56	58	46	26					33
ELL	72	75	62	67	53	44	60					57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	100			75								
HSP	82	71	60	75	60	40	65					58
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	88	70		75	80		70					
FRL	79	70	62	68	55	38	58					56

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	78%	56%	22%	54%	24%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	58%	12%	58%	12%
03	2023 - Spring	73%	52%	21%	50%	23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	90%	63%	27%	59%	31%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	64%	17%	61%	20%
05	2023 - Spring	83%	58%	25%	55%	28%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	79%	50%	29%	51%	28%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance during the 2022-2023 school year was 2nd Grade AP2 iReady Mathematics with 54% of students demonstrating proficiency. This was identical to AP2 data from the previous year. The major contributing factor leading to this being the lowest component was the introduction of a new mathematics textbook. Teachers indicated that students struggled with understanding the concepts required for mastery in the way that they were presented in the new text. This required additional remediation past the administration dates of the AP2 iReady math assessment, in order to gain mastery prior to the end of the school year.

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

The percent of 4th Grade students demonstrating mastery on the 2023 ELA FAST PM3 was 77% as compared to 88% percent of 4th grade students demonstrating mastery on the 2022 FSA ELA; a drop of 11 percentage points. Additionally, 4th grade students scoring in the green on iReady AP2 decreased from 76% in the 2022 school year to 64% in the 2023 school year; a loss of 12 percentage points in mastery. A factor that contributed to this decline was a significantly larger ELL population in 4th grade as compared to the previous year. Further data analysis demonstrated that the area of vocabulary was the

most deficient. Additional weaknesses can be attributed to the administration of a new format for ELA assessment during the 2023 school year.

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.

Data components indicate that students at Calusa Elementary scored above the state average in all areas. Fourth grade students, however, demonstrated the smallest gap above the state average with 18 percent more students demonstrating mastery, as compared to the state on the FAST assessment. ELA AP3 assessment. (Calusa = 77% demonstrating mastery; State = 59% demonstrating mastery)

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the percentage of 1st grade students demonstrating ELA proficiency on the 2023 iReady AP2 assessment as compared to the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency on AP2 assessment in 2022. In 2023, 82% of students demonstrated proficiency in ELA as compared to 67% in 2022. This reflects an increase of 15 percentage points. Teachers consistently monitored student assessment results and implemented remediation as needed based upon student results. iReady was utilized with fidelity.

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

The areas of concern for the 2023-2024 school year are:

- 1) Ensuring that incoming 5th grade students receive remediation in the identified areas of weakness based upon the 4th grade FAST ELA assessment results. Additionally, ensuring that 4th grade ELA teachers are cognizant of the areas that they may need to address more stringently with incoming students in order to increase student mastery.
- 2) Ensuring that incoming 3rd grade students receive remediation in the identified areas of weakness based upon the 2nd grade AP2 Mathematics results. Furthermore, ensuring that teachers are cognizant of the skills in Mathematics that they may need to address more stringently with 2nd grade students in order to increase student mastery.

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

1. Increasing 4th and 5th grade ELA proficiency
2. Increasing 2nd grade Mathematics proficiency
3. Implementing progress monitoring with fidelity to ensure pacing guides are followed and student needs are adequately addressed
4. PD to address instructional best practices in the areas in which 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students demonstrated the least success, as identified by F.A.S.T. AP3 results
5. Implementing teacher coaching in the area of Mathematics in order to work as a team to address the new Florida BEST Standards.

Area of Focus

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

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

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

According to the 2023 iReady AP2 results, 64% of 4th grade students were proficient in ELA as compared to 76% proficiency on the 2022 iReady AP2 results. This constitutes a drop of 12 percentage points. This area was identified as a crucial need, based on the data and the identified contributing factors of high numbers of ELL students, unknown words in grade level content, and teachers being unacquainted with new state standards. We will implement the Targeted Element of ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Academic Vocabulary instruction, 68% of 4th grade students will demonstrate proficiency in the ELA iReady AP2 assessment by January 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators will conduct quarterly data chats and classroom walk-throughs to ensure that quality instruction with rigor is taking place. Additionally, the Area of Focus will be monitored through ELA iReady AP1 and AP2 assessments. Teachers will also review iReady AP1 and Wonders Progress Monitoring bi-weekly assessments to closely track progress in order to evaluate results, and plan for differentiated instruction as well as interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aixa Reyes (219875@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 that will be used is Academic Vocabulary instruction. Teachers will consistently implement strategies such as interactive journals, interactive word walls, contextual reading, vocabulary apps/websites and visual aids for comprehension in their daily lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The implementation of the evidence-based strategy of Academic Vocabulary instruction was selected due to the results of the 2023 ELA iReady PM2 which demonstrated a weakness in the area of vocabulary. This area of weakness has, in part, resulted from the large increase of ELL students that have entered the school. Additionally, lack of consistent school-based instruction caused by the pandemic has impacted the level of enriched vocabulary that all students need for success in 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.

8/14-9/29 Teachers will meet monthly in order to collaborate, collect meaningful resources, share best practices and develop lesson plans targeting all levels of learners. As a result, teachers will have the appropriate resources necessary to engage students in meaningful and rigorous instruction.

Person Responsible: Aixa Reyes (219875@dadeschools.net)

By When: Administration will ensure that teachers are meeting monthly in order to plan collaboratively throughout the school year, until June 6, 2024.

8/14-9/29 Teachers will analyze data from bi-weekly ELA progress monitoring assessments in order to target areas of deficiencies and remediate instruction as needed. As a result, teachers will continue to monitor individual student progress during small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Aixa Reyes (219875@dadeschools.net)

By When: Administration will ensure that teachers are using data to drive instruction throughout the school year, until June 6, 2024.

8/14-9/29 Teachers will focus on improving student vocabulary skills by implementing interactive journals, interactive word walls, and vocabulary apps and websites. As a result, students will gain practice in word analysis and using context clues in order to increase reading comprehension skills.

Person Responsible: Aixa Reyes (219875@dadeschools.net)

By When: Administration will ensure that teachers are focusing on vocabulary instruction throughout the school year, until June 6, 2024.

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

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

According to the 2023 iReady AP2 results, 65% of 5th grade students were proficient in ELA as compared to 74% proficiency on the 2022 iReady AP2 results. This constitutes a drop of 9 percentage points. This area was identified as a crucial need, based on the data and the identified contributing factors of having a new computer-based testing platform and teachers being unacquainted with the new BEST state standards. Furthermore, student test score results demonstrated an overall weakness in the areas perspective and point of view within the iReady reading comprehension assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By prioritizing ELA and using data to drive instruction, at least 70% of 5th grade students will score a proficiency level of 3 or above on the ELA iReady AP2 by January 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators will conduct quarterly data chats and classroom walk-throughs to ensure that quality instruction and differentiated instruction is taking place. Additionally, the Area of Focus will be monitored through ELA iReady AP1 and AP2 assessments. Teachers will also review iReady AP1 and Wonders Progress Monitoring bi-weekly assessments to closely track progress in order to evaluate results and plan for differentiated instruction as well as interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzet Hernandez (212145@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 that will be used is Differentiated Instruction. Teachers will consistently implement strategies such as data-driven instructional small groups, question-answer responses, and the use of targeted comprehension skills in their daily lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The implementation of the evidence-based strategy of Differentiated Instruction was selected due to the results of the 2023 iReady PM2 which demonstrated a weakness in the areas of Perspective and Point of View. This area of weakness has, in part, resulted due to the change in state standards. The 5th grade students lack the familiarity of the new question styles as compared to previous formats. The new standards implement a more rigorous depth of knowledge in the areas of Perspective and Point of View. By teaching students to dissect questions, they will be able to critically think and analyze in order to be successful in 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.

8/14-9/29 Teachers will analyze data from Bi-Weekly Progress Monitoring Assessments in order to target areas of deficiencies and remediate instruction as needed. As a result, teachers will identify instructional groupings according to scores and align differentiated instruction to monitor individual student progress.

Person Responsible: Aixa Reyes (219875@dadeschools.net)

By When: Administration will ensure that teachers are conducting differentiated instruction throughout the school year, until June 6, 2024.

8/14-9/29 ELA teachers will attend district ICADS professional development courses to ensure that they are up to date on all new updates and best practices, as aligned by the BEST standards. Those who attend will return and debrief with grade level ELA teachers and focus on implementing Point of View and Perspective reading comprehension strategies.

Person Responsible: Aixa Reyes (219875@dadeschools.net)

By When: Administration will ensure that teachers are attending ICADS professional development courses throughout the school year, until June 6, 2024.

8/14-9/29 A schoolwide Accelerated Reader (AR) program will be implemented in order to increase Point of View and Perspective reading comprehension for 5th grade. Students will read independently and take comprehension tests to acquire AR points. Students will receive colored key tag tokens as they reach AR point level thresholds.

Person Responsible: Ana Diaz (maggiediaz@dadeschools.net)

By When: The Media Specialist will monitor proper use of the AR program, throughout the school year, until June 6, 2024.

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

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

Based on the data review, our school will target the area of School Safety. A review of parental feedback on the School Climate Survey, revealed a decrease in the area of school safety. School Climate Survey results showed that in 2023, 84% of parents felt strongly about the safety at our school, as opposed to 89% in 2022.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By increasing school safety measures and listening to parental concerns, at least 87% of parents will indicate that they feel their child is safe at school on the 2024 School Climate survey for parents.

Monitoring:

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

In order for parents to feel that their child is safe at school, they will be afforded opportunities to voice concerns and have confidence that their concerns are taken seriously. Parents will be able to provide input during monthly general PTA meetings, EESAC meetings, as well as through the school's main office. Administrators will maintain an open door policy in order for parents to express safety concerns privately. Administrators will also include school safety as a topic of discussion at all staff meetings so that teachers may communicate safety practices with parents.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzet Hernandez (212145@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 School Safety, the evidence-based strategy that will be implemented is: Consistent Protocols to Promote a Healthy and Safe School Environment. By consistently following safety protocols and listening to parent concerns, we hope to increase the number of parents that feel their child is safe at school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The need for consistent protocols to promote a safe school environment is a cornerstone in ensuring a productive educational organization. Our 2023 School Climate Survey indicated that 84% of parents strongly feel that their child is safe and secure at school in comparison to 89% in the prior year.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

8/14-9/29 Administration will conduct monthly emergency safety drills. After each monthly drill, administrators will convene key stakeholders to review and discuss the effectiveness of the drill and teachers will share results with parents through their communication platform. Administrators will implement suggested strategies to improve any deficiencies evident during the drills.

Person Responsible: Suzet Hernandez (212145@dadeschools.net)

By When: Administration will ensure that monthly emergency safety drills are conducted in a timely manner, throughout the school year, until June 6, 2024.

8/14-9/29 The school will remain a strictly closed campus, only authorized personnel and vetted volunteers will be allowed to enter the building during the school day. School security personnel will remain visible throughout the building at all times. Classroom doors will be locked at all times. Parents will be informed of all safety protocols being implemented in order to for them to feel that their child is safe and secure.

Person Responsible: Suzet Hernandez (212145@dadeschools.net)

By When: Administration and school security team will ensure the school remains a strictly closed campus and classroom doors are locked at all times throughout the school year, until June 6, 2024.

8/14-9/29 The School Resource Officer, as well as the school security team will demonstrate a presence at school by walking the halls and assisting with morning drop-off and afternoon dismissal. As a result, parents will feel a sense of safety and security.

Person Responsible: Suzet Hernandez (212145@dadeschools.net)

By When: Administration, SRO, and school security team will be visible on campus, throughout the school year, until June 6, 2024.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on our 2023 data review, 54% of students in 2nd grade demonstrated proficiency in Mathematics, according to iReady AP2. We are focusing on the area of Math in 2nd grade. This grade level consistently exhibits the lowest math scores when compared to all other grade levels. This long standing historical trend indicates a recurring challenge in mathematical comprehension.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By prioritizing the subject of Mathematics and using data to drive instruction, at least 60% of 2nd grade students will demonstrate proficiency on the iReady Math AP2 by January 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators will conduct quarterly data chats and classroom walk-throughs to ensure that quality instruction with rigor is taking place. Teachers will utilize iReady reports to monitor student progress and maintain fluid small groups in order to remediate necessary concepts. A schoolwide Math Reflex program will continue in order to provide foundational skills necessary to facilitate the understanding of new Math concepts. Teachers will monitor Reflex Math reports in order to ensure student usage.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aixa Reyes (219875@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 Mathematics, our school will focus on the Evidenced-Based Intervention of Corrective Feedback for Students. Corrective Feedback for Students will ensure that students will have ownership of their iReady progress and are accountable for adequate usage and reaching their attainable goal. Teachers will use iReady data to provide students with feedback and assign specific lessons in order to differentiate instruction based in individual student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Corrective Feedback for Students will ensure that teachers are conducting weekly data chats with their students to ascertain that students are working on relevant skills and consequently rewarded for their progress and achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

8/14-9/29 Teachers will follow the District's Math pacing guides with fidelity in order to drive instruction and ensure that all state standards are being implemented within the allocated window of time. Administrators will visit weekly collaborative planning sessions in order to guarantee the benchmarks within each standard are being addressed consistently by all teachers in the grade level.

Person Responsible: Aixa Reyes (219875@dadeschools.net)

By When: Administration will ensure that teachers are following the district's Math pacing guide throughout the school year, until June 6, 2024.

8/14-9/29 Administration will departmentalize 2nd grade teachers to make certain that there is an expert in the field for each subject, specifically in the area of Math. This will allow teachers to focus on one core subject area, thus facilitating an ease of planning and instruction of rigorous lessons.

Person Responsible: Aixa Reyes (219875@dadeschools.net)

By When: Administration will create the school's master schedule to allow for departmentalization in second grade for the school year, until June 6, 2024.

8/14-9/29 Teachers will analyze data from Math Topic Assessments and iReady in order to target areas of deficiencies and provide corrective feedback as needed. Teachers will also use data reports to remediate and implement effective differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Aixa Reyes (219875@dadeschools.net)

By When: Administration will conduct data chats to monitor Math data reports in second grade throughout the school year, until June 6, 2024.