

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Coconut Grove Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Coconut Grove Elementary School

3351 MATILDA ST, Coconut Grove, FL 33133

<http://coconutgrove.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.

Coconut Grove Elementary School's primary mission is to provide all students with an educational environment that will allow them to become self-directed, lifelong learners who are responsible citizens and positively contribute to our multicultural society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Coconut Grove Elementary School is a "School of Excellence" that offers a variety of educational programs that promote academic success, build character, and develop a sense of community. The faculty and staff set high expectations for students and encourage them to work to their fullest potential by ensuring a safe, culturally diverse, educational environment that is both challenging and motivating.

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
Hayes, Kristin	Principal	<p>The role of the principal is to be accountable for all aspects of the school site, to provide strategic direction, and to be the instructional leader who builds capacity of faculty and staff.</p> <p>The principal observes and evaluates teaching methods, monitors student achievement, and encourages parental involvement. The principal revises policies and procedures, monitors the budget, hires and oversees facilities. Other important duties include developing safety protocols and emergency response procedures</p>
Arana, Jeanette	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal assumes leadership of the school in the absence of the principal. She assists in the planning, development, organization, coordination, and supervision of instructional programs and activities while working collaboratively with the Principal to develop long and short-range plans for the school. The Assistant Principal develops and coordinates the Master Schedule, reviews plans for emergency situations, and maintains a commitment to staff, students, and stakeholders. Performs other related duties as needed.</p>
Banister, Leon	School Counselor	<p>Provide emotional support and counsel students; Student Support Team (SST) Coordinator.</p>
Solis, Jennifer	Instructional Media	<p>The Instructional Media (i.e. Media Specialist) supports reading and language arts by implementing a variety of instructional strategies that are carefully crafted to meet the unique needs of learners at each developmental stage. Additionally, she collaborates with classroom teachers, provides opportunities for storytime lessons, assists the literacy team with school wide activities, and supports the intervention program.</p>
Tingle, Sarah	Teacher, ESE	<p>Provide support services for students with disabilities; Ensures Individualized Education Plans (IEP) are being implemented with fidelity for students in Fourth and Fifth Grade; Professional Development Liaison.</p>
St. Leger, Nancy	Teacher, ESE	<p>Provide support services for students with disabilities; Ensures Individualized Education Plans (IEP) are being implemented with fidelity for students in Fourth and Fifth Grade; United Teacher of Dade (UTD) Representative.</p>
Koski, Cristina	Teacher, K-12	<p>Fourth Grade Gifted Teacher; Synergy Team Member; and Professional Learning Support Team (PLST) Lead Mentor.</p>
Peraza, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	<p>Third Grade Gifted Teacher; Synergy Team Member; and Professional Learning Support Team (PLST) Content Liaison.</p>

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 Improvement Plan (SIP) is developed using the most current FAST assessment data available to determine areas of improvement and gather feedback on contributing factors from teachers, staff, and parents through informal surveys. Students and their families have the opportunity to provide their input through Miami-Dade County Public Schools' School Climate Survey. The administrative team meets regularly with stakeholders and gathers information informally on initiatives.

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))

Data for each area of focus will be updated monthly and/or upon completion of the assessment period. This data will be shared with stakeholders during faculty and EESAC meetings. EESAC meetings are advertised publicly and posted on the school's monthly calendar as well as on social media pages inviting stakeholders to participate. During these meetings, surveys and feedback will be collected regarding the effectiveness of the implementation. Additionally, data reviews with instructional staff will include a template to guide teachers in analyzing data for subgroups.

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	63%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	28%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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	6	1	3	4	5	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	9	3	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	12	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	6	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	11	6	12	12	0	0	0	47

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	0	7	5	0	0	0	13

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	4	0	0	0	12	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	3	4	8	2	0	0	0	18	

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	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	4	0	0	0	12	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	3	4	8	2	0	0	0	18	

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	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	81	60	53	87	62	56	79		
ELA Learning Gains				78			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				70			53		
Math Achievement*	84	66	59	83	58	50	74		
Math Learning Gains				81			57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68			43		
Science Achievement*	80	58	54	88	64	59	75		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	52	63	59	87			65		

* 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	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	379
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	642
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	19	Yes	2	1
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	72			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	88			

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	60			

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	35	Yes	1	
ELL	81			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	63			
HSP	83			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	85			
FRL	70			

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	81			84			80					52
SWD	6			31							2	
ELL	70			80			86				5	52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			42							2	
HSP	80			84			80				5	42
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	83			90			89				4	
FRL	65			65			50				4	

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	87	78	70	83	81	68	88					87
SWD	38			31								
ELL	84	84	82	77	84		71					87
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	67			58								
HSP	90	78	64	83	85	83	88					93
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	86	78	90	86	80		89					
FRL	79	62	53	75	74	59	81					80

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	79	59	53	74	57	43	75					65
SWD	35			35								
ELL	80			89								65
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	50		33	70		36					
HSP	86	65		73	45		77					67
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	82	59		88	59		85					60
FRL	64	57		53	57	50	57					75

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	84%	56%	28%	54%	30%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	58%	15%	58%	15%
03	2023 - Spring	77%	52%	25%	50%	27%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	82%	63%	19%	59%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	86%	64%	22%	61%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	84%	58%	26%	55%	29%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	78%	50%	28%	51%	27%

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.

An analysis of the English Language Arts FAST Assessment Data indicates that the data component showing the lowest performance falls within our lowest 25% subgroup, with 28 percent of those students demonstrating proficiency. Factors contributing to this include computer based testing vs. paper and pencil testing as well as the two being completely different assessments.

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

A comparison of the 2023 English Language Arts FAST Assessment data to the 2022 administration of the English Language Arts FSA data indicates that this component showed the greatest decline. This decline was 10 percentage points, from 87 percent proficient to 77 percent proficient. Factors contributing to this include computer-based testing vs. paper and pencil testing as well as the two being completely different assessments.

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.

Our students with disabilities subgroup had the greatest gap in mathematics when compared to the state average. In addition, this subgroup performed below the 41% Federal Index Threshold on the 2021 and 2022 administration of the Mathematics Florida Standards Assessment, with students scoring at 35%.

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

A comparison of the 2023 Mathematics FAST Assessment data to the 2022 administration of the Mathematics FSA data indicates that this component showed the most improvement. This increase was one percentage point, from 83 percent proficient to 84 percent proficient. One new action taken this school year was the implementation of "DI" day in fourth grade.

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

An analysis of the Early Warning Systems data from the 2022-2023 school year indicates that nine percent of students had 16 or more absences while five percent of students had two or more disciplinary referrals. Therefore, attendance and disciplinary referrals, that include SESIR and SPAR incidents, are areas of concern.

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

Data driven, differentiated instruction, the utilization of technology programs with fidelity, and professional learning community opportunities.

Area of Focus

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

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

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

An analysis of the 2023 administration of the English Language Arts FAST Assessment indicates that 28% of students in the lowest 25 percentile subgroup demonstrated proficiency as compared to 70% of students demonstrating proficiency on the 2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment. This data demonstrates the need for consistent implementation of differentiated instructional techniques that are data driven in nature and monitoring of intervention data with fidelity to target this subgroup.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve if differentiated instruction, within the English Language Arts instructional block, is implemented with fidelity, is a 30% increase of students in the lowest 25 percentile subgroup demonstrating proficiency on the 2024 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking Assessment, (FAST) from 28% to 58%, respectively.

Monitoring:

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

The administrative team will conduct weekly walkthroughs and provide immediate corrective feedback on implementation of differentiated instruction. Data chats will be held after the administration of the i-Ready Assessment Period 1 (AP1) and FAST Progress Monitoring 1 (PM1) to provide teachers and the administrative team with a baseline as well as a plan of action.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristin Hayes (khayes@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.

An analysis of the 2023 administration of the English Language Arts FAST Assessment indicates that 28% of students in the lowest 25 percentile subgroup demonstrated proficiency as compared to 70% of students demonstrating proficiency on the 2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment. This data demonstrates the need for consistent implementation of differentiated instructional techniques that are data driven in nature and monitoring of intervention data with fidelity to target this subgroup. As a result, we will implement the Targeted Element of Differentiated Instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers will participate in a professional development session on differentiated instruction. This professional development session will provide an overview of differentiated instruction, best practices for implementation, and a "make and take" break out session. As a result, teachers will have ideas, strategies, and resource to begin implementation in their classrooms.

Person Responsible: Jeanette Arana (258960@dadeschools.net)

By When: This action step will be implemented on August 15, 2023.

Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs and provide teachers with constructive feedback as it relates to the implementation of differentiated instruction. Data will be collected to plan for best practices sessions.

Person Responsible: Jeanette Arana (258960@dadeschools.net)

By When: This action step will be implemented from August 17, 2023 - September 29, 2023.

Data chats will be held with grade levels to assist them with using data to develop flexible groups for differentiated instruction and identify students in need of Intervention.

Person Responsible: Jeanette Arana (258960@dadeschools.net)

By When: This action step will be implemented from September 20, 2023 - September 29, 2023.

#2. 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.

An analysis of the data from both the 2021 administration Mathematics Florida Standards Assessment and the 2022 administration of the Mathematics Florida Standards Assessment indicates that 35% of students with disabilities demonstrated proficiency. This is below the 41% Federal Index Threshold. This data demonstrates the need for collaborative planning, differentiated instruction, and benchmark-aligned instruction, therefore, 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.

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve if Collaborative Evaluation of Student Work for Students with Disabilities is implemented with fidelity, is a 20 percentage point increase, from 35% to 55%, in the number of students with disabilities demonstrating proficiency in Mathematics on the 2023 PM3 administration of the Mathematics Florida Assessment of Student Thinking.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by administration through attendance at grade level planning sessions, review of meeting minutes, and student performance on Math Topic Assessments. Teachers will be provided with feedback that is explicit, constructive, and corrective in nature as it relates to benchmark aligned and differentiated instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristin Hayes (khayes@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 implemented for this Area of Focus is Collaborative Evaluation of Student Work. Instructional staff will attend grade level collaborative planning sessions to identify the standards to be taught and to ensure that student work is fully aligned to the performance level of the standard. Instructional staff will evaluate student work as a grade level, or curriculum teams, to focus on practices that will improve student learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

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.

Grade Level and Department Chairs will meet with their teams to discuss weekly planning schedule and submit collaborative planning times to the administrative team.

Person Responsible: Jeanette Arana (258960@dadeschools.net)

By When: This action step will be implemented on August 15, 2023.

The leadership team will develop and distribute a discussion guide to facilitate collaborative conversations amongst grade level and curriculum teams.

Person Responsible: Jeanette Arana (258960@dadeschools.net)

By When: This action step will be implemented from August 14 – August 17, 2023.

Instructional staff will participate in a best practices for engaging in Collaborative Evaluation of Student Work. The session will focus on the development and implementation of rubrics to evaluate student learning as well as a self-reflection tool for students to monitor their own progress. “Make and Take” break out sessions will also be provided.

Person Responsible: Jeanette Arana (258960@dadeschools.net)

By When: This action step will be implemented on September 20, 2023.

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

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

An analysis of the data from the 2022-2023 school year indicates that nine percent of students had sixteen or more absences. This is a ten percent increase from the 2021-2022 school year when six percent of students had sixteen or more absences.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve if specific and targeted attendance initiatives are implemented with fidelity is a five percentage point decrease in the percentage of students with sixteen or more from nine percent to four percent.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored by monthly reports reviewed by the Attendance Committee.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeanette Arana (258960@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.)

Strategic Attendance Initiatives involve close monitoring and reporting of student absences, calls to parents, and more direct measures including home visits, counseling, and referrals to outside agencies. In addition, the school will provide incentives for students with perfect attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The implementation of the evidence based intervention attendance initiatives will provide a culture where families will self-monitor and become more aware of the negative impact absenteeism has on student learning.

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 administrative team will present a review of attendance policies and procedures based on MDCPS guidelines during the Opening of Schools meeting.

Person Responsible: Jeanette Arana (258960@dadeschools.net)

By When: This action step will be implemented on August 14, 2023.

The administrative team will create an informational flier for parents/guardians that delineates attendance policies and its impact on student performance.

Person Responsible: Jeanette Arana (258960@dadeschools.net)

By When: This action step will be implemented on August 17, 2023.

The Attendance Review Committee will identify students who have 16 or more absences during the 2023-2024 school year. Administration and Student Services will contact the parents of these students to discuss attendance initiatives and identify strategies that can be implemented from the beginning of the school year.

Person Responsible: Leon Banister (lbanister@dadeschools.net)

By When: This action step will be implemented from August 17, 2023- September 29, 2023.

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

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

An analysis of the Early Warning Signs data indicates that five percent of students had two or more disciplinary referrals during the 2022-2023 school year. This is a three percent increase from the 2021-2022 school year when two percent of students had two or more disciplinary referrals. This data demonstrates a need to implement a schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (PBS) plan.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve if a Positive Behavior Support (PBS) plan is implemented with fidelity is a two percent decrease in the percentage of students receiving two or more behavioral referrals by from five percent to three percent.

Monitoring:

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

The Student Support Team will meet monthly with the administrative team to review disciplinary data, including referrals, to ensure the plan is being implemented with fidelity. This will also serve as an opportunity to provide feedback and make adjustments for improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeanette Arana (258960@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.)

Positive Behavior Support (PBS) is one of the foremost advances in schoolwide discipline. Also, it is the emphasis on schoolwide systems of support that include proactive strategies for defining, teaching, and supporting appropriate student behaviors to create positive school environments. Instead of using a piecemeal approach of individual behavioral management plans, a continuum of PBS for all students within a school is implemented in areas including the classroom and non-classroom settings (such as hallways, buses, and restrooms). PBS is an application of a behaviorally-based systems approach to enhance the capacity of schools, families, and communities to design effective environments that improve the link between research-validated practices and the environments in which teaching and learning occurs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

An analysis of the Early Warning Signs data indicates that five percent of students had two or more disciplinary referrals during the 2022-2023 school year. This is a three percent increase from the 2021-2022 school year when two percent of students had two or more disciplinary referrals. This data indicates the need for unified and consistent response to incidents and the need for a more proactive approach from all stakeholders. Student behavior impacts the learning environment and the time spent outside of the classroom negatively impacts student achievement, therefore, we will implement the Targeted Element of Positive Behavior Support (PBS).

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.

Implement a disciplinary committee to review the Student Code of Conduct, the schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (PBS) plan, and provide feedback for clarity and efficiency.

Person Responsible: Jeanette Arana (258960@dadeschools.net)

By When: This action step will be implemented from August 14, 2023 - August 15, 2023

Present teachers with the Positive Behavior Support Plan during Professional Development day.

Person Responsible: Sarah Tingle (sarahtingle@dadeschools.net)

By When: This action step will be implemented on August 15, 2023

Teachers will create classroom management plans that are aligned with the Student Code of Conduct, the Positive Behavior Support (PBS) plan and Miami-Dade County Public Schools Vision, Mission, and Values Matter initiative.

Person Responsible: Leon Banister (lbanister@dadeschools.net)

By When: This action step will be implemented on August 15, 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 process should include a review of the use of the school's resources supported by all funding sources (federal, state and local) including both general funds and funds dedicated to school improvement activities.

The Master Schedule from the 2022-2023 school year lacked sufficient time for collaborative planning. This impacted the teachers' ability to share resources and best practices as grade and curriculum groups. The 2023-2024 Master Schedule has been adjusted to provide for more opportunities for teachers to collaborate during planning time.

During the 2022-2023 school year we were given an additional ESE allocation, which would have been instrumental in supporting our primary students with disabilities, however, we were unable to find viable candidates for this position. It would be instrumental to hire an additional ESE teacher to support these students as well as a reading interventionist for those students who require additional support with reading foundational skills. The administrative team has been proactively searching and interviewing possible candidates to fulfill these areas of need for the 2023-2024 school year.

Furthermore, while teachers have the instructional materials for the Reading Horizons intervention program, more time needs to be allocated for training as it relates to program components and preparing for intervention groups. During the 2023-2024 school year funds will be requested from EESAC to be allocated for vocabulary enrichment materials for each grade level.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

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

Yes