

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Miami Beach Feinberg/Fisher K 8 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	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	26
VI. Title I Requirements	29
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	31

Miami Beach Feinberg/Fisher K 8

1420 WASHINGTON AVE, Miami Beach, FL 33139

<http://fienberg.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 mission of Miami Beach Feinberg/Fisher K8, in partnership with our families and diverse community, is to develop healthy, civic minded, innovative individuals. It is our goal to empower students to reach their maximum potential and becoming caring, reflective, life-long learners with a balanced international perspective, and sense of social responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering and nurturing internationally minded life-long learners.

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
Murphy, Mary	Principal	Principal provides strategic direction and support as she oversees the delivery of instruction, monitor student achievement, encourages parental involvement, manages facilities, and provides a common school vision. The principal involves all stakeholders in school-wide decision-making related to school based plans and activities, curriculum and instruction, and school operations.
Fuentes, Georgina	Assistant Principal	Assistant principal provides assistance to the principal in managing the school.
Carrillo, Renee	Science Coach	STEAM and Science content coach provides support to teachers in data analysis, integration of technology, best practices for instruction, cross curricular instruction, professional development, assessment, instructional planning, science curriculum resources, and STEAM designation requirements
Jeanbaptiste, Pierrela	Instructional Coach	International Baccalaureate content coach provides support to teachers in data analysis, integration of technology, best practices for instruction, cross curriculum instruction, professional development, instructional planning, and IB Primary Years Programme (PYP)/ Middle Years Program (MYP) Planner Projects and Reflections. Testing Coordinator manages administration of operations relating to and professional development involved in district and state testing for grades pre-K to 8.
Pena, Zuleica	School Counselor	School counselor who encourages and supports a positive academic, social, and personal development for students through a comprehensive school counseling program. She collaborates with educators in pre-K to 8 classrooms and integrate the student development curriculum which includes lessons centered on anti-bullying , mindfulness, and social emotional learning to help students achieve the desired competencies appropriate to their developmental level.
Pearson, Philip	Instructional Media	Media specialist who takes on many delegated tasks from administration including managing school social media accounts and e-mail. Grouping managing and promoting physical and digital libraries, morning announcement, school events and activities relating to literacy, promoting a positive school culture, and school safety directive (i.e. ID cards for staff and students).
Yanes, Veronica	Teacher, ESE	Chair of the Exceptional Student Education Dept. and LEA for a department for exceptional education. Who takes on all responsibilities relating to ESE screening, requirements, and students.
Pearson, Gareth	Math Coach	Math content coach provides support to teachers in data analysis, integration of technology, best practices for instruction, intervention,

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		instructional planning, cross curricular instruction, professional development, assessment, and math curriculum resources.

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 School Advisory Council (EESAC) is involved in the preparation and evaluation of the school improvement plan. EESAC is the sole body responsible for the final decision-making at the school related to the implementation of the school improvement plan. Separate committees are formed to assist the school advisory council in the preparation of the School Improvement Plan. Such committees include Reading, Writing, Mathematics, Science, Parental Involvement and Discipline & Safety

SIP Monitoring

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

The School Advisory Council meets monthly to review, evaluate and discuss the School Improvement Plan and school budget to ensure the proper implementation of SIP Action Steps and spending of the fiscal school year budget towards student tutorial programs, teacher training, instructional materials, technology and additional support staff.

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	92%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	77%
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	10	12	11	6	4	5	9	10	67	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	4	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	12	2	6	14	10	4	48	
Course failure in Math	0	0	10	6	4	15	19	12	7	73	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	30	31	28	40	36	184	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	20	28	33	23	19	137	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	39	40	57	37	35	37	55	57	357	

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	2	21	15	27	30	31	22	148

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	16	14	4	5	5	11	10	12	77	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	20	2	4	13	4	8	55	
Course failure in Math	0	1	7	19	6	7	15	14	3	72	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	26	21	35	31	32	170	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	21	22	41	32	35	171	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	24	43	30	25	49	52	40	264	

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	26	19	19	35	30	37	173

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	8	25	1	0	1	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	5

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	9	12	11	7	4	5	9	11	19	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	5	20	2	4	13	4	8	56
Course failure in Math	0	11	3	7	15	19	12	7	10	84
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	50	34	27	43	36	40	230
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	36	30	38	25	21	15	165
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	39	41	41	57	38	40	64	63	53	436

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	2	3	35	29	32	33	23	31	188	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3

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*	35	61	53	39	62	55	37		
ELA Learning Gains				55			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			52		
Math Achievement*	49	63	55	41	51	42	40		
Math Learning Gains				63			50		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			49		
Science Achievement*	33	56	52	30	60	54	31		
Social Studies Achievement*	79	77	68	65	68	59	62		
Middle School Acceleration	95	75	70	94	61	51	71		
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	63	62	55	54	75	70	51		

* 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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	375
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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	538
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	30	Yes	2	1
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	53			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	51			

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	53			

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	34	Yes	1	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	54			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	53			

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	35			49			33	79	95			63
SWD	17			29			17	65			6	44
ELL	24			43			23	76			6	63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			60			14				3	
HSP	34			47			32	77	95		7	63
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	45			48			60				3	
FRL	34			48			34	80	93		7	66

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	39	55	39	41	63	58	30	65	94			54
SWD	19	39	43	28	46	46	5	39				38
ELL	30	53	42	35	59	58	19	59	87			54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	58		29	56							
HSP	36	53	41	41	63	60	31	59	97			54
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	65	70		52	70		29					
FRL	37	54	40	40	63	59	29	64	94			54

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	37	57	52	40	50	49	31	62	71			51
SWD	19	60	74	26	50	53	36	45				35
ELL	27	52	50	36	49	51	16	53				51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26	58		15	21							
HSP	36	56	50	40	51	49	29	63	71			50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	44	60		52	70							
FRL	35	56	52	39	50	50	30	60	72			50

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	43%	56%	-13%	54%	-11%
07	2023 - Spring	32%	50%	-18%	47%	-15%
08	2023 - Spring	36%	51%	-15%	47%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	21%	58%	-37%	58%	-37%
06	2023 - Spring	28%	50%	-22%	47%	-19%
03	2023 - Spring	20%	52%	-32%	50%	-30%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	51%	58%	-7%	54%	-3%
07	2023 - Spring	40%	48%	-8%	48%	-8%
03	2023 - Spring	39%	63%	-24%	59%	-20%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	64%	-26%	61%	-23%
08	2023 - Spring	64%	59%	5%	55%	9%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	58%	-18%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	13%	40%	-27%	44%	-31%
05	2023 - Spring	39%	50%	-11%	51%	-12%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	56%	40%	50%	46%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	48%	*

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	65%	6%	63%	8%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	68%	0%	66%	2%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The data component with the lowest performance is grade 8 Science. According the FDOE data report, the percent of students scoring Level 3 or above on the 2023 Science State Assessment in grade 8 is 13%. (Link: <https://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/5668/urlt/55G8SRSSpring23.xls>) Trends include an increase of 7 percentage points from 10% to 17% from 2021 to 2022 followed by a decline of 4 percentage points from 17% to 13% from 2022 to 2023. Factors that contributed to this decline include an influx of students that entered our school from other countries throughout the course of the school year, posing challenges due to language barriers. Additionally, in grade 8 the higher scoring students are placed in Biology and take the Biology EOC.

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

The data component with the greatest decline from the prior year is grade 4 ELA, followed by grade 4 mathematics. For grade 4 ELA, the percent of students scoring at a Level 3 or above decreased by 31 percentage points, from 52% in 2022 to 21% in 2023. For grade 4 mathematics, the percent of students scoring at a Level 3 or above decreased by 27 percentage points, from 68% in 2022 to 38% in 2023. Factors that contributed to this decline include changes in staff for grade 4. Two 4th grade teachers from the prior year transferred and one 4th grade teacher retired mid-year so students were without a consistent teacher until a new teacher was hired. The teacher hired was a first year teacher, replacing one of our most successful teachers in terms of student achievement and state assessment data, posing a challenge to achieve the same results as a seasoned veteran teacher.

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 with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is grade 4 ELA, followed by grade 8 science. For grade 4 ELA, the percentage of students scoring at a Level 3 or above was 58% for the state and 21% for MBFFK8, 37 percentage points lower than the state. For grade 8 science, the percentage of students scoring at a Level 3 or above was 44% for the state and 13% for MBFFK8, 31 percentage points lower than the state.

Trends for grade 4 ELA include an increase of 15 percentage points from 37% to 52% from 2021 to 2022 followed by a decline of 31 percentage points from 52% to 21% from 2022 to 2023. Contributing factors previously shared include three staff changes in grade 4 as well as the fact that grade 4 lost one of its most successful teachers in terms of student achievement and state assessments, posing a challenge to achieve the same results with a first year teacher, beginning mid-year.

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 from 2022 to 2023 was grade 8 mathematics, with an increase of 34 percentage points, followed by grade 3 and grade 6 mathematics, both showing an increase of 15 percentage points. For grade 8 mathematics, 64% of students scored a level 3 or above in 2023 versus 30% in 2022. For grade 6 mathematics, 51% of students scored a level 3 or above in 2023 versus 36% in 2022. For grade 3 mathematics, 39% of students scored a level 3 or above in 2023 versus 24% in 2022. Actions that contributed to this improvement include coplanning, coteaching, and push-in services provided in grade 3, the availability of a structured Study Hall for students identified as needing additional time and assistance to be successful, as well as strategic targeting of students for before/after school tutoring and Saturday School. Furthermore, a math interventionist was hired this school year and provided push-in support in 3rd grade.

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

In reviewing the Early Warning Systems (EWS) data from Part I of the School Improvement Plan, as well as cross-referencing with current 2023 FAST PM3 data, the two indicators that are potential areas of concern are: (1) Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency, and (2) Number of students scoring a Level 1 on the 2023 statewide FAST ELA assessment. According to PowerBI data, in 2022 the number of students scoring Level 1 on the 2022 FSA ELA was 170 and FSA Math was 171, showing both as an area of concern for the 2022-2023 school year. However, according to the 2023 FAST data, the number of students scoring Level 1 in ELA increased to 230 while the number of students scoring Level 1 in Math decreased to 165. Both remain an area of concern, however, the greater emphasis for 2023-2024 is on the Early Warning Indicator of the number of students scoring a Level 1 in ELA due to this change.

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

The highest priorities for the 2023-2024 school year include:

1. An emphasis on Learning Gains, especially for our lowest 25% in both ELA and Mathematics.
2. A targeted focus on supporting bubble students to ensure they progress to proficiency on FAST PM3
3. Ensuring students in the primary grades, K-2, receive the support needed so that they have the foundation needed to be successful in grade 3, and beyond.
4. Ensuring the success of our first 7th grade cohort of Algebra 1 Honors students for the progression into our first 8th grade cohort of Geometry Honors the following school year.

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 2022-2023 FAST PM3 data for ELA, the percentage of 3rd-8th grade students scoring level 3 or above at MBFFK8 was 30% as compared to 51% for the district, 21 percentage points lower than the district average. Since the greatest deviations from district averages was evidenced in ELA, this content area was identified as an area of critical need. Based on the data and the following contributing factors:

- the Early Warning Indicator with the greatest number of students was "high number of students with substantial reading deficiencies" and
- a high number of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students with limited readiness levels that impede their ability to master grade level tasks.

we will implement the Targeted Element of Collaborative Evaluation of Student Work.

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 Evaluation of Student Work, the percentage of 3rd-8th grade students scoring level 3 or above in ELA will increase by a minimum of 2 percentage points as evidenced by the 2023-2024 FAST PM3 by June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will monitor teacher participation in collaborative planning sessions focused on the collaborative evaluation of student work for English Language Arts. Additionally, the Leadership Team will monitor the impact of Collaborative Evaluation of Student Work on student learning by analyzing data from state and district progress monitoring assessments such as i-Ready and F.A.S.T.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Georgina Fuentes (320491@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.)

Collaborative Evaluation of Student Work refers to the calibration process which makes scoring student work more consistent among a group of educators and more aligned to the standards upon which rubrics and scoring criteria are based. The success of such a process is dependent on a culture in which all educators are collaborative and focused on reflective practice to improve student learning. This process is particularly relevant for grade-level or content-alike teams of teachers using common assessments as evidence for Student Learning Objectives.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Given the recent transition to the B.E.S.T. standards, there is a need to ensure that student tasks/ assignments are aligned to the content of the standards and that the level of student understanding demonstrated in the completion of the tasks mirrors the expectations of the standards at the appropriate level of rigor.

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.

08/14 - 08/31: Common grade level teams will develop or identify a shared rubric to utilize during ELA collaborative planning sessions in order standardize the analysis of student work samples. As a result, clear, standards-aligned expectations will be communicated to students and student work samples will be reviewed with a common vision for evidence of student success.

Person Responsible: Georgina Fuentes (320491@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 31, 2023

09/01 - 10/26: Teachers will attend regularly scheduled collaborative planning sessions for ELA in order to collaboratively review student work samples using the shared rubric and provide student feedback. As a result, teachers will ensure common misconceptions/errors are addressed and that the level of student understanding demonstrated mirrors the expectations of the standards.

Person Responsible: Georgina Fuentes (320491@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 26, 2023

09/01 - 10/26: Based on the analyses of student work samples during collaborative planning sessions, teacher will adjust their instructional practices to address student needs. As a result, teachers will have student groups, appropriate resources, and lesson plans that reflect differentiation based on student needs.

Person Responsible: Georgina Fuentes (320491@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 26, 2023

The leadership team will attend common grade level collaborative planning sessions for ELA to ensure fidelity to the evidence-based intervention, Collaborative Evaluation of Student Work. As a result, the leadership team will be able to provide feedback to grade level teams on shared best practices.

Person Responsible: Mary Murphy (mmurphy@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 26, 2023

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to the 2023 FAST ELA PM3 data, 30% of grades 3-8 students were proficient in ELA as compared to the district average of 51% and state average of 50%. According to the 2023 STAR reading test 13% of grades K-2 as compared to the district average of 49%. On the 2023 FAST math PM3 data, 47% of grades 3-8 students were proficient in math as compared to the district average of 59% and state average of 56%. On the 2023 STAR math test 45% of students grade k-2 as compared to the district average of 68%. In addition, based on the Statewide Science assessment for 5th grade scoring a 39% compared to the district average of 50% and the state average of 51%. The 8th-grade students scored a 13% compared to the district assessment of 40% and the state assessment of 44%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: The presence of a significant population of English Language Learners (ELL) and varying levels of student preparedness impose constraints on their ability to effectively achieve grade-level proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school has set proficiency targets for the upcoming academic year. For grades 3-8, the goal is to increase ELA proficiency from 30% to 40%, nearing the district's 51% and state's 50% averages. In grades K-2, reading proficiency aims to rise from 13% to 25%, approaching the district's 49%.

In math, grades 3-8 targets are set to boost from 47% to 56%, aligning with the state and nearing the district's 59%. For grades K-2, the objective is to enhance from 45% to 55%, reducing the gap with the district's 68%.

For science, 5th-grade students aim to improve from 39% to 45%, closing in on the district's 50% and state's 51%. In 8th grade, the goal is 13% to 25% proficiency, and in biology, an ambitious jump from 71% to 90% is targeted, aligning with district and state levels.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring the progress of the school's desired outcomes in terms of increasing proficiency in Math and ELA (English Language Arts) for grades k-8 and Science grades 5, 8 and biology proficiency can be achieved through several key measures. These measures involve collecting and analyzing data, setting targets, and implementing appropriate interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Renee Carrillo (reneecarrillo@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.)

Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of: acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability. Research demonstrates this method benefits a wide range of students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The data presented in the 2023 FAST Math and ELA PM3 and STAR reading and math test, as well as the 2023 science FCAT results, reveal concerning disparities in student proficiency levels compared to district and state averages. In order to address these challenges and promote improved academic outcomes, an evidence-based intervention is required. Differentiated instruction emerges as a viable approach to cater to the diverse needs of students, taking into account the identified contributing factors such as the presence of a significant population of English Language Learners (ELL) and varying levels of student preparedness.

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.

08/17 - 10/26: Data Collection: The school needs to gather baseline data on the current proficiency levels in Math and ELA for grades 3-8 as well as math and reading for grades K-2. This data can be obtained through the students PM1 scores. The initial data will serve as a reference point to track progress and identify the gaps that need to be narrowed.

Person Responsible: Gareth Pearson (319249@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 26, 2023

08/17 - 10/26: Set Measurable Goals: With the instructional coaches and teachers will set specific measurable goals for the students in ELA and Math. These goals will provide clear targets for improvement and can be used as benchmarks for monitoring progress.

Person Responsible: Gareth Pearson (319249@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 26, 2023

08/17 - 10/26: Regular Assessments: Teachers will implement regular benchmark assessments throughout the academic year to measure student progress and proficiency levels in ELA and Math. These assessments can be conducted at regular intervals (e.g., quarterly or bi-annually) to track individual and group growth. The results will help identify students who may require additional support and guide intervention strategies.

Person Responsible: Georgina Fuentes (320491@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 26, 2023

08/17 - 10/26: Data Analysis: Quarterly Data chats with Administration, instructional coaches and teachers to analyze the assessment results to gain insights into student performance, strengths, and areas for improvement. This analysis should be conducted on an individual, and class level. It will help identify trends, patterns, and gaps in proficiency levels compared to the district and state averages.

Person Responsible: Mary Murphy (mmurphy@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 26, 2023

#3. 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.

For the 2022-23 school year PM3 13% of Students with Disabilities (SWD) met the proficient achievement level for ELA. This number is significantly lower than the set goal of 28% for the school year. However, the subgroup increased from 28% in Math to 33%; from 5% in Science to 12%; and from 39% in Social Studies to 64% in proficiency. Based on the data there needs to be a change in Instructional Planning for SWDs to ensure that they are receiving the instructional support, resources, and accommodations identified in their instructional education plan. High-Impact Collaborative Planning between Exceptional Student Education (ESE) teachers and the General Education teacher will provide expertise in the lesson development process to ensure strategies are adopted to support the academic development of SWDs. Additionally, academic coaches will initiate Inter-school Collaboration with local school(s) that have similar demographics whose students are achieving proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By successfully implementing High-Impact Collaboration and Inter-school Collaboration the percentage of SWDs achieving proficiency will increase by 7 percentage points to 20% in ELA and 2 percentage points to 35% in Math as evidenced by the 2023-2024 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

Monitoring:

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

The school's instructional coaches will monitor the successful implementation of the High-Impact Collaboration by reviewing common planning agendas and progress monitoring data. Inter-school Collaboration will be monitored by at least two meetings with another M-DCPS school with similar demographics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Veronica Yanes (vrod06@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.)

High-Impact Collaborative planning is an evidence-based strategy where educators work together to create meaningful improvements in student learning. Grounded in research and data analysis, this approach involves systematic examination of student performance data, setting clear learning objectives, and applying evidence-based instructional practices. Collaborators engage in ongoing formative assessment, feedback loops, and reflective discussions to fine-tune strategies. By leveraging the collective expertise of educators and aligning planning decisions with research-backed practices, high impact collaborative planning optimizes teaching effectiveness and enhances student outcomes.

Inter-school collaboration refers to a strategic partnership between two or more educational institutions aimed at sharing resources, expertise, and best practices to achieve mutual goals. This collaborative approach brings schools together to leverage their collective strengths, enhance teaching and learning, and improve overall educational quality. Inter-school collaboration involves joint efforts in curriculum development, professional development opportunities, student activities, and problem-solving. By fostering a culture of shared knowledge and innovation, inter-school collaboration promotes positive outcomes for students, educators, and the broader educational community.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

High-impact collaborative planning offers a compelling rationale for students with disabilities by harnessing the combined knowledge of educators. Through shared expertise, this approach tailors instructional strategies to meet the unique needs of these students, optimizing their learning outcomes. Collaborators identify evidence-based practices and research-backed interventions that have proven effective for students with disabilities, ensuring inclusive and equitable education. Regular feedback, data analysis, and ongoing assessment within collaborative planning refine strategies to address specific challenges and promote the growth of students with disabilities, fostering a culture of continuous improvement.

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.

Establish clear goals with Grade Level Chairs for common instructional planning to include the Inclusion teacher.

Person Responsible: Georgina Fuentes (320491@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/21/2023 through 09/29/2023

Inclusion teachers will review student IEP goals with the General Education teacher to begin the collaborative planning process.

Person Responsible: Georgina Fuentes (320491@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/21/2023 through 09/29/2023

Develop a common planning meeting schedule for Inclusion and General Education teachers and attend meetings.

Person Responsible: Georgina Fuentes (320491@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/21/2023 through 09/29/2023

Grade Level Team and Inclusion teacher will develop strategies for instruction in order address the individual learning needs of SWDs.

Person Responsible: Georgina Fuentes (320491@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/21/2023 through On-going

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

For the 2022-2023 school year 36% of the faculty and staff missed 10.5 days or more, this is up from the 2021-2022 school year where 33% missed 10.5 days or more. Additionally, 36% of our students missed 11 or more days up from the 2021-2022 school year where 35% of students missed 11 or more days. Our teachers would benefit from a positive and supportive environment that encourages teachers to prioritize their attendance while providing them with resources and incentives and strategies to help reduce absences. Further, a formal school-wide homeroom attendance program to incentivize student attendance would serve to increase attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Successful implementation of an attendance initiative would decrease the number of students who miss valuable instructional time six percentage points from 36% to 30%. An attendance initiative for faculty and staff would decrease the number of absences ten percentage points from 36% to 26%.

Monitoring:

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

“Freeze Your Absences Rewards” program will involve teachers using magnets to spell the words “PERFECT ATTENDANCE” for everyday their class gets 100% attendance. The class will be rewarded icicles for every “PERFECT ATTENDANCE” cycle. “Attendance Boost Initiative 1-2-3” program will encourage teachers to find alternates to missed days 1. Split your class and arrive a little late; 2. Split your class and leave a little early; and 3. Take a half day.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary Murphy (mmurphy@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.)

Many studies have shown that providing tangible rewards, such as certificates, small gifts, or recognition, can lead to short-term increases in attendance rates. Students may be motivated by the immediate rewards and recognition they receive for attending school regularly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

There is evidence that suggests that programs rewarding school attendance can be effective in improving attendance rates and overall student engagement. There is also evidence that suggest programs to address employee absenteeism work well to decrease missed work-days.

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 Committee will develop plans and procedures to implement the "Freeze Your Absences" rewards program.

Person Responsible: Pierrela Jeanbaptiste (pierrelaj@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/21/2023 through 09/29/2023

Administration create and present plans for the "Attendance Boost Initiative" with a plan for communication with Grade Level Chairs.

Person Responsible: Mary Murphy (mmurphy@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/21/2023 through 09/29/2023

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 Advisory Council (EESAC) advises the principal in the development of the school's budget in order to support school improvement. The Miami Beach Feinberg-Fisher K-8 Center budget is discussed at the meetings and changes to the budget are discussed regularly. A portion of the school's budget, an allocation of \$5.00 for every FTE in the school, is controlled directly by the EESAC. All stakeholders are given an opportunity to vote or come to consensus about how these funds are allocated.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

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

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

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

Based on the Spring 2022-2023 FAST STAR assessment data, the school-wide median percentile for proficiency was 30. Kindergarten students scored an average of 20 percentage points, 1st Grade scored an average 30 percentage points, and 2nd grade scored an average of 31 percentage points. First and

second grade demonstrate a need for reading intervention implementation. Further, differentiated instruction and progress monitoring continues to ensure students are mastering the appropriate grade level benchmarks and ELA during the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Based on 2022-2023 FAST PM3 assessment data approximately 35% of 3rd through 8th grade students scored at a Level 3 or above. In 3rd through 5th grade there were no grade levels that scored above 50% on the most recent state assessments. The percentage of students demonstrating proficiency in each grade level are as follows 20% of 3rd grade students down from 24%, 21% of 4th grade students down from 52%, 48% of 5th grade students up from 42%. Implementing the Reading Horizon's reading intervention program with fidelity will provide academic support to increase student reading. Additionally, evidence-based research shares that student data chats allow students to participate and lead in their own learning. Differentiated instruction and progress monitoring continue to help ensure students are mastering the appropriate grade level benchmarks and ELA during the 2023-2024 school year.

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

By successfully implementing Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI) via the Reading Horizons intervention program and employing differentiated instruction in ELA, we expect that at least 35% of grade K-2 students will score at grade level or above in the 2023-2024 state summative assessment at the end of the school year.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By successfully implementing Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI) via the Reading Horizons intervention program with fidelity as well as implementing a school-wide student data chat program we expect that the percent of students achieving proficiency on the 2023- 2024 states summative assessment will increase by at least five percentage point from 35% in the 2022-2023 school year to 40% in the 2023-2024 school year.

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.

Instructional coaches will regularly attend common planning with grades K-5 to monitor progress of implementation of the intervention program and differentiated instruction.

Instructional coaches will monitor Reading Horizon's web-based data results and utilize results for

teachers' data chats.

Administration will monitor student data chat progress with classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Asencio, Monica, 233716@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?

Reading intervention programs are evidence-based practices, further, utilizing the M-DCPS intervention program ensures that the practice is aligned with the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan and to the BEST ELA Standards.

Differentiated instruction is an evidence-based framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues for learning. The curriculum that will be used in conjunction with DI aligns to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards and the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan.

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?

Reading intervention programs are developed based on rigorous research and evidence-based practices for literacy education. These programs incorporate methods and strategies that have been shown to be effective in improving reading skills. With a diverse student population, differentiated instruction is essential in meeting students' academic needs and providing the remediation necessary to help close learning gaps, as well as the enrichment needed to promote growth for students who are on grade level. Targeting student needs and utilizing data to plan for DI increase overall proficiency in ELA.

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
Instructional Reading Coach will identify and create intervention groups of students to target and a schedule for when the intervention will occur. Training will be provided for teachers implementing the Reading Horizon's to address fidelity.	Asencio, Monica, 233716@dadeschools.net
Instructional Reading Coach, interventionists, and paraprofessionals will provide consistent support to teachers for intervention and DI.	Asencio, Monica, 233716@dadeschools.net
Instructional coaches and teachers will analyze progress monitoring data to track student growth and inform instructional planning, meet regularly during grade level department meetings to identify and create an intervention plan for at risk students, and conduct data chats and retention prevention meetings between all stakeholders.	Asencio, Monica, 233716@dadeschools.net
Teacher lesson plans will include DIY instruction teachers will identify differentiated student groups and utilize appropriate differentiated resources.	Fuentes, Georgina, 320491@dadeschools.net

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP is discussed at every School Advisory Council (EESAC) meeting, it is part of the regular agenda. Additionally, the School Improvement Plan is shared at the PTA meeting following the final approval of the SIP. Sharing school improvement information is also part of the Parent and Family Engagement Plan for Title I

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))

Miami Beach Feinberg/Fisher K-8 utilizes several methods to communicate with parents. School-wide automated phone calls and text messages are used to update parents of goings-on. Flyers and pictures of school activities are posted weekly on the school's social media. Additionally, MBFFK8 teachers are encouraged to use the ChatM-DCPS app introduced by the district to communicate with parents.

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)

Miami Beach Feinberg/Fisher K-8 has a variety of enrichment programs that are offered as part of the curriculum and for those students that may not be able to have certain enrichment classes, many enrichment programs are offered after-school. We are a STEAM School and offer Robotics (during/after school) and science clubs. We partner with the City of Miami Beach to offer visual arts (drawing/painting) and performance arts (ballet). Further, our school is known on Miami Beach for our Music program (during school) and Rock Ensemble (after school). These programs are offered for both the elementary and middle grades.

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))

Separate committees are formed to assist the School Advisory Council (EESAC) in the preparation of the School Improvement Plan. Such committees include Reading, Writing, Mathematics, Science, Parental Involvement and Discipline and Safety committees.

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))

N/A

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).

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$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