

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Coral Park 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	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Coral Park Elementary School

1225 SW 97TH AVE, Miami, FL 33174

<http://coralparkelementary.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.

It is the mission of Coral Park Elementary School, together with the support of the parents and community, to instill values so that each student will become a responsible, confident, and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Coral Park Elementary is to instill the values of life-long learning into the youngest citizens in our community.

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
Leyte-Vidal , Marlene	Principal	School Principal: Serving in the capacity of governing agent, the principal and assistant principal bears the responsibility of the overall operation of the MTSS/RTI and the school. This position will share the existing commonalities for this team, and facilitate meetings and interactions that transpire. Roles also include: imparting the purpose and vision for accessing and using data-based decision making; evaluate the MTSS/RTI skills of school personnel; monitor and supervise the proper implementation of intervention as well as ensure that a meticulous record keeping system is in place; provide professional development to support MTSS/RTI implementation, and maintain an open channel of communication with parents as it relates to school-based MTSS/RTI functions, plans and projects.
Diaz, Naymi	Reading Coach	Reading Coach: The responsibilities of the coach include, reviewing and implementing instructional curriculum; offer feedback and create a plan to improve instruction and student achievement. Instructional Coaches also co-plan lessons with teachers; analyze student's work; interpret assessment data for the purpose of using results for instructional decision making. They will also conduct individual and group discussions with students and assist with assessing students in the effective implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans. Reading coaches lead professional development workshops, model strategies, or techniques for teachers, and conduct collaborative lessons. They have a strong influence on the overall reading program in the school. They serve as advocates for the literacy program.
Mejido, Vivian	Math Coach	Math Coach: The responsibilities of the coach include, reviewing and implementing instructional curriculum; offer feedback and create a plan to improve instruction and student achievement. Instructional Coaches also co-plan lessons with teachers; analyze student's work; interpret assessment data for the purpose of using results for instructional decision making. They will also conduct individual and group discussions with students and assist with assessing students in the effective implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans. Math coaches lead professional development workshops, model strategies, or techniques for teachers, and conduct collaborative lessons. They have a strong influence on the overall math program in the school. They serve as advocates for the mathematics program.
Delvalle, Annette	Parent Engagement Liaison	Parent Engagement Liaison: The responsibilities of the liaison include, coordinating parent engagement activities that build the home to school connection and collaborating with teachers to assist parents in accessing educational resources. The Parent Engagement Liaison works closely with the school's Leadership Team to develop a system that allows for timely response to parent questions and concerns, as well as ensuring parents are kept informed of the school's overall mission, vision, and goals.
Bellon, Christina	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal: Serving in the capacity of governing agent, the principal and assistant principal bears the responsibility of the overall operation of the MTSS/RTI and the school. This

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

position will share the existing commonalities for this team, and facilitate meetings and interactions that transpire. Roles also include: imparting the purpose and vision for accessing and using data-based decision-making; evaluate the MTSS/RTI skills of school personnel; monitor and supervise the proper implementation of intervention as well as ensure that a meticulous record keeping system is in place; provide professional development to support MTSS/RTI implementation, and maintain an open channel of communication with parents as it relates to school-based MTSS/RTI functions, plans and projects.

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 Leadership Team and EESAC meet monthly to discuss SIP Goals, Action Plan, and progress towards goals. EESAC members, including parent and student representatives, can give suggestions on SIP development during these meetings. The School Improvement Plan is also discussed at the beginning, middle, and end of the year with staff during Faculty Meetings. SIP Goals and Action Plans are discussed quarterly during Principal Data Chats allowing teachers, instructional coaches, and administration the opportunity to track progress towards goals and provide input on necessary adjustments and revisions.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP plan and goals will be monitored quarterly during Principal Data Chats with grade levels and during Leadership Team Meetings.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	99%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	83%
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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	20	14	9	10	9	9	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	3	6	13	2	4	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	5	5	8	1	7	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	35	21	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	31	20	0	0	0	62
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	21	34	33	38	49	37	0	0	0	212

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	3	3	18	23	19	0	0	0	66

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	5	0	2	0	0	0	7
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	14	10	9	8	8	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	5	7	9	3	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	10	4	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	15	18	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	15	17	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	11	18	25	24	0	0	0	78

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	0	4	4	16	12	0	0	0	36

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	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	7
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	14	10	9	8	8	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	5	7	9	3	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	10	4	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	15	18	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	15	17	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	11	18	25	24	0	0	0	78

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	0	4	4	16	12	0	0	0	36

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	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	7
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*	67	60	53	72	62	56	72		
ELA Learning Gains				70			63		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			39		
Math Achievement*	75	66	59	71	58	50	66		
Math Learning Gains				69			52		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			42		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	75	58	54	58	64	59	66		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	60	63	59	59			42		

* 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	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	347
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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	505
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	42			
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	69			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	63			

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	36	Yes	1	
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	63			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	60			

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	67			75			75					60
SWD	33			53			35				5	55
ELL	63			74			70				5	60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	67			75			75				5	60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	59			69			66				5	56

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	72	70	56	71	69	50	58					59
SWD	31	41	31	41	43	46	10					43
ELL	70	67	51	70	67	46	50					59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	72	69	55	71	69	50	59					59
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	69	68	56	67	64	48	53					57

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	72	63	39	66	52	42	66					42
SWD	35	42	40	37	52	36	48					25
ELL	69	62	38	62	45	37	60					42

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	72	64	39	66	50	41	65					41
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	70	58	38	64	50	39	64					43

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	68%	56%	12%	54%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	60%	58%	2%	58%	2%
03	2023 - Spring	63%	52%	11%	50%	13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	84%	63%	21%	59%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	64%	0%	61%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	72%	58%	14%	55%	17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	71%	50%	21%	51%	20%

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 2022-2023 data indicates that ELA Reading showed the lowest performance. Sixty-four percent of students in grades 3-5 demonstrated proficiency in ELA, while 73% of students in grades 3-5 demonstrated proficiency in Math, and 71% of grade 5 students demonstrated proficiency in science. A contributing factor to the decline in ELA proficiency may be attributed to the new FAST online testing platform. Additionally, remnants of COVID learning loss, and a greater need for depth of instruction may have contributed to this decline. Further analysis of the data shows that across grades 3-5 the overall trend was that students scored lowest on Informational Text and Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary.

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

A comparison of 2022 and 2023 scores shows the greatest decline was in ELA achievement. ELA achievement for students in Grades 3-5 declined from 72% in 2022 to 64% on the 2023 FAST PM3. The factors that may have contributed to this decline are a change in testing platform and method of delivery, since the 2022-2023 school year was the first year students in these grades were assessed using an online platform rather than the traditional pencil-paper method. Additionally, remnants of COVID learning loss, and a greater need for depth of instruction may also have been contributing factors.

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.

A comparison of the school's 2022-2023 FAST PM3 performance to the performance of students across the state, indicates the school's performance is above state average scores in every area, except 4th grade ELA Informational Text where our scores were 1% below those of the state (13% compared to 14%). Factors that contributed to this trend were an increase of beyond the bell learning opportunities (i.e. before school tutoring and Saturday Academy), as well as during school targeted instruction for critical students (Crunch-Time Tutoring).

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

The data component that showed the greatest improvement was the Science Statewide Assessment (up from 58% proficient in 2022 to 71% proficient in 2023) and Math (from 71% in 2022 to 77% in 2023). New actions in the 2022-2023 school year included increased focus on rigor and depth of instruction, emphasis on STEAM and Science instruction across all grade levels (PK-5), offering multiple opportunities for enrichment and additional instruction via Saturday Academy. Additionally, students participated in Title I Tutoring, Crunch-Time Tutoring, and the K-3 Tutoring program. Systematic data-driven discussions with principal and instructional coaches throughout the year were also advantageous in creating maximum learning opportunities for all students.

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

An identified potential area of concern is the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency, as well as the number of students in Grade 5 showing two or more indicators according to the school's EWI data. In Grades 1-5, a total of 170 students have a substantial reading deficiency, and Grade 5 students

have both the highest number of students with a reading deficiency and the highest number of students with two or more indicators.

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

Going into the 2023-2024 school year the highest priorities for school improvement are a continued focus on benchmark-aligned instruction, instructional coaching and professional learning, increased quality of small group instruction, differentiated instruction to meet the needs of our student population, and collaborative planning to ensure on-grade level and rigorous instruction is taking place across all grade-levels.

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 PM 3 data, 64% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in ELA as compared to a 73% proficiency of students in grades 3-5 on the 2021-2022 ELA FSA. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of changes in testing modality (paper-based to CBT), remnants of COVID related learning-loss, and level/ depth of instruction, we will implement the Targeted Element of Instructional Coaching/ Professional Learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As a result, the measurable outcome after implementing the Evidence-based Intervention of Instructional Coaching/ Professional Learning, will be an average increase of 10 percentage points in the 2023-2024 FAST PM 3 ELA proficiency for students in grades 3-5. Therefore, the 2023-2024 FAST PM 3 would increase from 64% to 74%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through the analysis of FAST, I-Ready, and Performance Matters assessments during weekly Grade-Level meetings, monthly Leadership Team meetings, and quarterly Principal Data Chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marlene Leyte-Vidal (mleyte-vidal@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus is Instructional Support/ Coaching and Data Driven Instruction. Instructional coaches will participate in weekly Grade-Level meetings and support teachers with analysis of data and development of instruction that meets the needs of all students. Instructional coaches will also model effective instructional strategies as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Instructional Support/Coaching is when teachers work together to set a measurable goal to improve instructional outcomes. Coaching Cycles focus on the identified goal and increases the achievement and engagement of every student by bringing out the best performance of every teacher. Coaches use both student-centered and teacher-centered methods to help teachers improve the decisions they make about their instruction

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.

From 8/14/23-9/29/23, Instructional Coaches will attend weekly Grade-Level Meetings to guide discussions on data-driven instruction and provide needed support to teachers. As a result, teachers will implement data-driven lessons to increase academic achievement.

Person Responsible: Naymi Diaz (naydiaz@dadeschools.net)

By When: By 8/17/23 and ongoing throughout the year.

From 8/14/23-9/29/23, the Instructional Coach will support teachers in the implementation of inquiry-based, standards-aligned ELA instruction. As a result, students will have daily opportunities to develop critical thinking skills and create reflective work that furthers their learning.

Person Responsible: Naymi Diaz (naydiaz@dadeschools.net)

By When: By 8/17/23 and ongoing throughout the year.

From 8/14/23-9/29/23, the PLST members will develop meaningful professional learning opportunities for staff to assist in creating rigorous, inquiry-based instruction, aligned to the state's B.E.S.T. standards. As a result, teachers will be equipped with the instructional strategies necessary to develop rigorous academic instruction.

Person Responsible: Yenier Rodriguez (yrodriquez15@dadeschools.net)

By When: During the August 18 Professional Development Day.

#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.

According to the 2022-2023 FAST PM 3 ELA data, 33% of students in the SWD subgroup achieved proficiency. While this is a 2% increase from the 2021-2022 FSA ELA proficiency percentage for this subgroup, it is still below the recommended federal threshold. Based on this data, the area of focus will be targeting instruction towards the intensive acceleration of this subgroup in order to increase their percent of proficiency by 10 percentage points, from 33% to 43%. We will implement Differentiated Instruction and Collaborative Planning in order to achieve this outcome.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Differentiated Instruction and Collaborative Planning, the measurable outcome will be an increase of 10 percentage points in proficiency for the SWD subgroup as measured by the 2023-2024 FAST ELA PM3.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored weekly during Grade-Level meetings, monthly during Leadership Team meetings, and quarterly during Principal Data Chats utilizing data from Power Bi, FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments (PM1 & PM2), I-Ready, and Performance Matters Assessments. Teachers and Instructional Coaches will collaborate to monitor student growth and redefine teaching strategies and implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marlene Leyte-Vidal (mleyte-vidal@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus is Differentiated Instruction and Collaborative Data Chats. Collaborative planning and vertical planning sessions will be utilized to design and implement lessons that provide students with different avenues to learning so that all students within this subgroup can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

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.

From 8/14/23-9/29/23, the Leadership Team will establish a common planning time schedule. As a result, teachers will be provided with opportunities to share best practices and collaborate in differentiating instruction to meet the needs of SWD students.

Person Responsible: Christina Bellon (bellon@dadeschools.net)

By When: By 8/17/23.

From 8/14/23 - 9/29/23, the Instructional Coach will support teachers during common planning time in analyzing data to create Differentiated Instruction groups and provide instructional resources for those groups. As a result, teachers will be able to create DI groups and scaffold instruction to meet the needs of learners in their classrooms.

Person Responsible: Naymi Diaz (naydiaz@dadeschools.net)

By When: Beginning 8/17/23 and ongoing throughout the year.

From 8/14/23 - 9/29/23, the Leadership Team will establish dates for quarterly Data Chats. As a result, there will be opportunities for data analysis to monitor SWD student progress and guide adjustments to DI instruction as necessary.

Person Responsible: Marlene Leyte-Vidal (mleyte-vidal@dadeschools.net)

By When: By 8/17/23

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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 ELA PM3 scores, 64% percent of students in Grades3-5 demonstrated proficiency. This is a decline of 8 percentage points from the 2021-2022 ELA FSA scores for students in Grades 3-5. Specifically, the areas of Informational Text and Vocabulary where the lowest strands in meeting percent of students showing proficiency. Based on this data, the identified contributing factor is a greater need for depth of instruction across all grade levels. As such, we will implement the targeted element of Benchmark-aligned Instruction to ensure students receive rigorous, inquiry-based learning that will allow them to grow academically.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of the Effective Questioning/ Response Technique to guide instruction, students in Grades 3-5 will show an increase of 10 percentage points in the areas of Informational Text and Vocabulary as evidenced by the 2023-2024 FAST ELA PM3.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored by ongoing data chats at the grade-level and with Instructional Coaches, and Principal during Data Chats throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marlene Leyte-Vidal (mleyte-vidal@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus is Effective Questioning/ Response Technique. This strategy will assist teachers in developing higher-order thinking questions, will allow students to think critically, and will provide rigorous instruction for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective Questioning and Response Techniques are an important part of classroom instruction which is used to develop higher-order thinking skills, promote critical thinking, and/or gauge whether students understand what is being taught (formative assessment).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

From 8/14/23-9/29/23, teachers will utilize Webb's Depth of Knowledge wheel as resource during their planning. As a result, ELA lesson plans will contain evidence of higher-level questioning and opportunities for authentic student work during administrative walk-throughs.

Person Responsible: Marlene Leyte-Vidal (mleyte-vidal@dadeschools.net)

By When: By 8/17/23 and ongoing throughout the year.

From 8/14/23 - 9/29/23, ELA Interactive Journals will be implemented to reflect evidence of inquiry-based learning, in-depth development of vocabulary, and analysis of fictional and informative text. As a result, students will develop the critical thinking skills and vocabulary necessary for the analysis of complex informational text.

Person Responsible: Christina Bellon (bellon@dadeschools.net)

By When: By September 1, 2023

From 8/14/23 - 9/29/23, Junior Great Books will be utilized as a supplemental instructional resource to promote depth of learning and allow students to apply comprehension strategies beyond the textbook. As a result, students will have additional opportunities beyond the textbook to gain a deeper understanding of B.E.S.T. standards-aligned instruction.

Person Responsible: Naymi Diaz (naydiaz@dadeschools.net)

By When: By 8/31/23 and ongoing throughout the year.

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance

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 Power BI Staff Attendance Report, 38% of our teachers were absent more than 10 days during the 2022-2023 school year. This shows a growing trend from 15% in 2020-2021, to 36% in 2021-2022, and up to 38% in 2022-2023. Contributing factors to this increase in staff absences may be attributed to remaining quarantine guidelines surrounding COVID during the 2021-2022 and the 2022-2023 school years and teacher burn-out. Based on this data and the identified contributing factors, we will implement rewards and incentives for teachers to promote daily attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of rewards and incentives for teachers, the percentage of teachers with more than 10 absences during the 2023-2024 school year will have decreased from 38% to 28% by June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be measured via staff attendance reports monthly and shared with staff during monthly Faculty Meetings to recognize and celebrate teachers with Perfect Attendance for each month.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marlene Leyte-Vidal (mleyte-vidal@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus is rewards and incentives. Teacher attendance will be monitored monthly and teachers with Perfect Attendance for each month will be recognized and rewarded for their commitment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for this Evidence-based intervention is to motivate teachers to come to work daily by recognizing them for their efforts. Recognizing staff's commitment to their students by being present everyday, will promote a pleasant work environment where members feel valued. Feeling valued and being rewarded for their efforts will mitigate teachers' feelings of being "burnt-out" and will decrease the number of absences for staff.

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.

From 8/14/23 - 9/29/23, the Leadership Team will develop an Attendance Incentive Plan to promote staff attendance on a monthly basis. As a result, staff will be motivated to improve their attendance.

Person Responsible: Marlene Leyte-Vidal (mleyte-vidal@dadeschools.net)

By When: By September 1, 2023.

From 8/14/23 - 9/29/23, administration will monitor staff attendance and create a list of staff with Perfect Attendance on a monthly basis. As a result, changes in staff attendance will be monitored and adjustments to the Attendance Incentive Plan can be made.

Person Responsible: Marlene Leyte-Vidal (mleyte-vidal@dadeschools.net)

By When: Beginning September 1, 2023 and ongoing throughout the year.

From 8/14/23 - 9/29/23, staff with perfect attendance will be recognized during monthly faculty meetings. As a result, staff will feel valued and appreciated for their commitment to their students.

Person Responsible: Marlene Leyte-Vidal (mleyte-vidal@dadeschools.net)

By When: Beginning September 27, 2023 and ongoing monthly throughout the year.

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).