

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Devon Aire K 8 Center School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Devon Aire K 8 Center

10501 SW 122ND AVE, Miami, FL 33186

<http://devonaire.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.

To develop each child intellectually, socially, and emotionally utilizing a team approach.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We strive to be the school that others aspire to be.

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
Arango, Milagro	Principal	Mrs. Arango, mlarango@dadeschools.net, is the principal. She manages the operation and the educational programs of the school.
Pachon-reboredo, Ana	Assistant Principal	Ms. Pachon, apachon-reboredo@dadeschools.net, is an assistant principal. She manages the educational programs of the school focusing on grades K-4 in addition to overseeing professional development.
Audain, Dominique	Assistant Principal	Ms. Audain, audaind@dadeschools.net, is an assistant principal. She manages the educational programs of the school focusing on grade 4-8 and the ESE department.
Fernandez, Lucia	Other	Ms. Fernandez, lucyfernandez@dadeschools.net, is the school assessment coordinator. She manages the assessment calendar, securing all necessary testing documents, and training staff in assessment procedures.
Verdeja, Rebecca	ELL Compliance Specialist	Ms. Verdeja, rverdeja@dadeschools.net, is a middle school ELL teacher. She serves as the ELL liaison, managing the ELL program. In addition, she is the EESAC Chair.
McNeal, Felicia	Teacher, K-12	Ms. McNeal, fmcneal@dadeschools.net, is a kindergarten teacher. She facilitates communication between administration and the kindergarten department.
Poldo, Yvonne	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Poldo, 208916@dadeschools.net, is a first grade teacher. She facilitates communication between administration and the first grade department.
Diaz, Sandra	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Diaz, sdiaz2@dadeschools.net, is a second grade teacher. She facilitates communication between administration and the second grade department.
Milnes, Valerie	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Milnes, vmilnes@dadeschools.net, is a third grade teacher. She facilitates communication between administration and the third grade department. She also serves on the EESAC and the Synergy team.
Delcuadro, Mary	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Del Cuadro, mdelcuadro@dadeschools.net, is a fourth grade teacher. She facilitates communication between administration and the fourth grade department.
Villa, Catherine	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Villa, cvilla@dadeschools.net, is a fifth grade teacher. She facilitates communication between administration and the fifth grade department.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Aronowsky-Kunkel, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Kunkel, jkunkel@dadeschools.net , is a teacher of the gifted. She serves as a member of the Synergy team.
Baez, Miriam	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Baez, mbaez11@dadeschools.net , is a middle school teacher. She facilitates communication between administration and the eighth grade department. She also serves as the PTSA liaison.
Martinez-Gonzalez, Manaure	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Martinez-Gonzalez, magonzalez@dadeschools.net , is a middle school teacher. She facilitates communication between administration and the mathematics department.
Medina, Monica	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Medina, monicamedina@dadeschools.net , is a middle school teacher. She facilitates communication between administration and the sixth grade department.
Aleman, Monica	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Aleman, alemanmonica@dadeschools.net , is a middle school teacher. She facilitates communication between administration and the seventh grade department.
Miranda, Yolanda	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Miranda, ymiranda@dadeschools.net , is a middle school teacher. She facilitates communication between administration and the science department.
Moral-Villar, Mercedes	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Moral, mmoral@dadeschools.net , is a middle school teacher. She facilitates communication between administration and the ESE department.

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.

Stakeholder involvement is an ongoing process in SIP development. Established communication channels used amongst the stakeholders include surveys, data chats, grade level/department meetings, and special interest meetings, such as PTSA and EESAC. Both quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed to identify trends, strengths, and areas for improvement.

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))

Action steps will be executed while ensuring regular monitoring and evaluation of progress. Updates will be provided to stakeholders which include communicating successes, challenges, and adjustments. It is essential transparency and accountability are maintained throughout the monitoring process. Throughout the implementation, effectiveness of action steps will be assessed. Identification and implementation of additional action steps will be based on the evolving progress.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	93%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	64%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	12	7	7	3	6	13	11	24	29	112
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	2	4	3	0	0	1	0	1	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	3	1	2	3	4	3	17
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	12	18	36	41	39	156
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	7	14	19	30	32	109
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	17	14	12	13	31	53	70	83	303

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	1	3	6	5	9	19	29	24	96

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	5	1	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2

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	9	7	6	3	7	10	15	82
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	16
Course failure in ELA	0	4	4	2	2	0	5	2	3	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	1	1	10	8	4	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	7	4	21	38	23	95
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	9	5	35	40	27	118
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	7	11	11	0	7	36	53	173

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	4	4	2	7	1	20	31	16	85

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	4	4	2	1	0	1	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	9	7	6	3	7	10	15	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	16
Course failure in ELA	0	4	4	2	2	0	5	2	3	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	1	1	10	8	4	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	7	4	21	38	23	95
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	9	5	35	40	27	118
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	7	11	11	0	7	36	53	129

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	4	4	2	7	1	20	31	16	85

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	4	4	2	1	0	1	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	63	61	53	70	62	55	67		
ELA Learning Gains				62			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			38		
Math Achievement*	70	63	55	70	51	42	58		
Math Learning Gains				74			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			27		
Science Achievement*	55	56	52	53	60	54	38		
Social Studies Achievement*	72	77	68	85	68	59	64		
Middle School Acceleration	77	75	70	69	61	51	75		
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	70	62	55	76	75	70	69		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	479
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	667
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	45			
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	62			
BLK	54			
HSP	68			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	72			
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	48			
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	59			
HSP	66			

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	62			

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	63			70			55	72	77			70
SWD	38			44			29	53			6	57
ELL	44			58			17	56			6	70
AMI												
ASN	75			65			45				3	
BLK	46			61							2	
HSP	63			71			54	72	76		7	71
MUL	70			70							2	
PAC												
WHT	67			71			73		75		4	
FRL	54			59			48	61	66		7	63

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	70	62	44	70	74	64	53	85	69			76
SWD	37	50	34	45	63	63	30	60				46
ELL	51	52	41	58	64	57	33	80				76
AMI												
ASN	85	73		73	86		85					

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
BLK	56	37		72	74		55					
HSP	69	61	46	70	73	63	49	83	65			77
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	84	78		72	80	60	92	100				
FRL	64	58	45	62	70	63	42	85	54			74

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	67	52	38	58	40	27	38	64	75			69
SWD	38	40	30	36	35	31	21	47				50
ELL	56	47	43	48	31	23	27	61				69
AMI												
ASN	78	60		63	35							
BLK	59	29		50	31							
HSP	67	51	38	58	40	30	40	61	74			68
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	72	61		56	42	0	25		80			
FRL	63	48	34	51	35	25	33	66	68			69

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	59%	56%	3%	54%	5%
07	2023 - Spring	54%	50%	4%	47%	7%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	57%	51%	6%	47%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	58%	17%	58%	17%
06	2023 - Spring	56%	50%	6%	47%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	69%	52%	17%	50%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	70%	58%	12%	54%	16%
07	2023 - Spring	34%	48%	-14%	48%	-14%
03	2023 - Spring	76%	63%	13%	59%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	84%	64%	20%	61%	23%
08	2023 - Spring	62%	59%	3%	55%	7%
05	2023 - Spring	70%	58%	12%	55%	15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	50%	40%	10%	44%	6%
05	2023 - Spring	47%	50%	-3%	51%	-4%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	56%	36%	50%	42%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	52%	48%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	65%	30%	63%	32%

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.

According to 2023 FAST/EOC Proficiency data, the data component showing the lowest performance is Science. In 2023, the proficiency score was 50%. This is an increase compared to 2022 which showcased a proficiency score of 36%. While a 14 percentage point increase is evident, Science remains the lowest performing area. Not only is this the lowest across the tested subjects, but it is also below the district average which is at 52%. A contributing factor for the low performance could be related to the minimal emphasis on science instruction within the primary grades.

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

According to 2023 FAST/EOC Proficiency data, the data component showing the greatest decline is Civics. In 2022, proficiency was 84% compared to 68% in 2023. This is a 16 percentage point decrease. A contributing factor to this decline was a change in instructional staffing.

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.

According to 2023 FAST/EOC Proficiency data, the data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Science. The school site proficiency score is 50% compared to the state average of 63%. This is a 13 percentage point difference. The minimal emphasis on science instruction within the primary grades could be a contributing factor for the performance gap.

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

According to 2023 FAST/EOC Proficiency data, the data component showing the most improvement is middle school acceleration. In 2022, the proficiency was 89%; however in 2023, this increased to 96% (a 7 percentage point increase). A contributing factor for this growth could be the availability of a reference sheet for state testing. This promoted less rote memorization.

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

According to the EWS Student Attendance data from 2022-2023, student attendance and ELA performance are areas of concern. Approximately 11% of the student population was absent 10% or more during the school year, with the greatest numbers in kindergarten, seventh grade, and eighth grade. Furthermore, 29% of the student population is showing a substantial reading deficiency across the grade levels.

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

Upon analysis of 2023 FAST/EOC Proficiency data and EWS data, the highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year will target Civics performance, ELA performance, and student attendance. Addressing Civics performance is vital to rebound from the 16 percentage point decrease. Additionally, ELA performance needs to be addressed to adequately prepare students for success on the FAST ELA as well as targeting specific skills to minimize the reading deficiency across grade levels. Last, student absences with 0-5 days is higher than the district. Student attendance has a correlation to student performance.

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 Social Studies**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 Civics EOC, 67% of the Civics students were proficient as compared to 85% on the 2021-2022 Civics EOC. Based on the data and the identified contributing factor of instructional staffing changes, student readiness levels were impacted. Therefore, we will implement the Targeted Element of Social Studies.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Social Studies, an additional 3% (for a total of 70%) of the Civics students will score at grade level or above on the Civics EOC by Spring 2024.

Monitoring:

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

The administrative team consisting of Ms. Arango, Ms. Pachon, and Ms. Audain, along with the Social Studies department will participate in quarterly data chats focusing on student strengths and targeting areas for improvement. Data analysis of formative assessments will be reviewed monthly to make plans for differentiation. In addition, the administrative team will conduct informal walkthroughs to ensure high quality instruction is evident.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dominique Audain (audaind@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Within the Targeted Element of Social Studies, our school will focus on the Evidence-based Intervention of: Instructional Support/Coaching. The Social Studies department will work together to develop best practices and set attainable goals to improve instructional outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Instructional Support/Coaching builds teacher confidence by providing them with the tools, resources, and support they need to succeed.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

8/14 - 9/29: The Civics department chair will share Gateway resources with the department. As a result, teachers will have access to tools that can be employed to demonstrate an increase in student performance.

Person Responsible: Monica Aleman (alemanmonica@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14 - 9/29

8/14 - 9/29: A Civics teacher will attend the Civics Academy. As a result, the teacher will gain strategies to be utilized for student success.

Person Responsible: Dominique Audain (audaind@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14 - 9/29

8/14 - 9/29: The Civics department will participate in collaborate planning to review the test item specifications and best practices. As a result, the department will be able to provide targeted instruction.

Person Responsible: Monica Aleman (alemanmonica@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14 - 9/29

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

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

According to the 2022-2023 FAST PM3 data, 61% of students in grades 3-8 were proficient as compared to 70% in 2021-2022. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of standard and assessment changes, student readiness levels were impacted. Therefore, we will implement the Targeted Element of ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of ELA, an additional 4% (for a total of 65%) of students in grades 3-8 will score a level 3, 4, or 5 on the FAST ELA PM3 by Spring 2024.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team consisting of Ms. Arango, Ms. Pachon, Ms. Audain, Ms. Fernandez, Ms. Verdeja, Ms. McNeal, Ms. Poldo, Ms. Milnes, Ms. Del Cuadro, Ms. Villa, Ms. Kunkel, Ms. Baez, Ms. Martinez-Gonzalez, Ms. Medina, Ms. Aleman, Ms. Miranda, and Ms. Moral-Villar will conduct quarterly data chats, adjust groups based on current data in real time, and follow-up with regular walkthroughs to ensure that ELA instruction is aligned to current standards. Data will be analyzed during Leadership Team meetings to ensure students are demonstrating growth on standards. Extended learning opportunities will be provided to those students who are not showing growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ana Pachon-reboredo (apachon-reboredo@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Within the Targeted Element of ELA, our school will focus on the Evidence-based Intervention of: Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM). Ongoing Progress Monitoring will ensure teachers are evaluating student responsiveness to instruction as it is monitored through data sheets and data chats. Data chats will be between teacher and individual student, in addition to data chats between administration and individual grade levels.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Ongoing Progress Monitoring encourages teachers to collect and analyze data in order to evaluate and improve their instructional practice. Additionally, Ongoing Progress Monitoring ensures instruction is standards-aligned and data-driven.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

8/17 - 9/29: Teachers will administer the F.A.S.T Progress Monitoring 1 Assessment. As a result, teachers will have a baseline of each student's strengths and areas for improvement.

Person Responsible: Lucia Fernandez (lucyfernandez@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17 - 9/29

8/17 - 9/29: Teachers will conduct student to teacher data chats based on the results of F.A.S.T Progress Monitoring 1 Assessment. As a result, intermediate goals can be set to show growth during the second assessment window.

Person Responsible: Milagro Arango (pr7361@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17 - 9/29

8/17 - 9/29: Grade levels and departments will meet with their respective department to review the results of F.A.S.T Progress Monitoring 1 Assessment. As a result, intermediate goals can be set to show growth during the second assessment window.

Person Responsible: Ana Pachon-reboredo (apachon-reboredo@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17 - 9/29

#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.

According to the Student Attendance Three Year Comparison, 40% of students were absent 0-5 times in 2022-2023. This is a 6 percentage point increase from 2021-2022 where 34% of students were absent 0-5 times. Based on the data and the identified contributing factor of post-COVID parenting, student attendance levels were impacted. Therefore, we will implement the Targeted Element of Early Warning System.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Early Warning System, a decline of 5 percentage points (for a total of 35%) of the students will be absent 0-5 times by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The administrative team consisting of Ms. Arango, Ms. Pachon, and Ms. Audain, and the counseling department consisting of Ms. Gutierrez, Ms. Dawson, and Ms. Aguiar, will provide teachers with information about iAttend protocol at the Opening of School meeting. When absences occur, teachers will contact parents and document contact. Additionally, teachers and counselors will communicate regarding students with excessive absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dominique Audain (audaind@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Within the Targeted Element of Early Warning System, our school will focus on the Evidence-based Intervention of: Attendance Initiatives. Attendance Initiatives closely monitor and report student absences by utilizing effective communication to parents. Implementing student incentives will also be coordinated.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Attendance is an important factor in student success. When students have high absenteeism, studies show students have lower achievement in reading and mathematics. Regular attendance cultivates a classroom and school-wide community between students and 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.

8/15: At the Opening of School meeting, the counseling department will disseminate information on the attendance reporting protocol, iAttend, with the staff. As a result, teachers will be aware of their responsibilities to monitor student attendance.

Person Responsible: Dominique Audain (audaind@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/15

8/17 - 9/29: Coordinate ConnectEd and social media messages directed towards parents/families, concerning the importance of student attendance. As a result, parents will be educated on the importance of attendance for academic success.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Verdeja (rverdeja@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17 - 9/29

8/21 - 8/25: The quarterly attendance initiative will be introduced to students over the morning announcements. As a result, individual classes will begin tracking attendance.

Person Responsible: Milagro Arango (pr7361@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/21 - 8/25

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

According to the Staff School Climate Survey, 70% of respondents stated strongly agree with the statement, "School personnel work together as a team," in 2022-2023. Similarly, in 2021-2022, 69% of respondents selected strongly agree for this statement. This indicates an only 1 percentage point increase, year over year. Based on the data, which demonstrates little improvement, and the identified contributing factor of lack of common planning time, teacher teamwork and morale were impacted. Therefore, we will implement the Targeted Element of Other.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Other, an additional 5% (for a total of 75%) of the respondents will select strongly agree to the statement, "School personnel work together as a team," as evidenced by the School Climate Survey 2024.

Monitoring:

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

The administrative team consisting of Ms. Arango, Ms. Pachon, and Ms. Audain, will communicate with grade level/department chairs to gather feedback on school operations. In addition, a school generated climate survey will be used midyear to gather feedback and suggestions from staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Milagro Arango (pr7361@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Within the Targeted Element of Other, our school will focus on the Evidence-based Intervention of: School Spirit, Pride, and Branding. School Spirit, Pride, and Branding builds school spirit and encourages team camaraderie.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School Spirit, Pride, and Branding fosters a sense of belonging among staff. This sense of camaraderie has a powerful influence on school culture. As camaraderie builds, teachers will feel a sense of being a valued member of a team. Increased collaboration will allow teachers to play to their strengths and learn from one another.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

8/15 - 8/17: The administrative team will provide teachers with school spirit shirts. As a result, school spirit shirts can promote school pride when the staff wear the shirts on a particular day.

Person Responsible: Milagro Arango (pr7361@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/15 - 8/17

8/15: The administrative team will provide an Opening of School lunch to the staff. As a result, this will encourage staff to mingle with one another and form relationships.

Person Responsible: Milagro Arango (pr7361@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/15

8/15: The administrative team will lead a team building activity during the Opening of School meeting. As a result, there will be an increase in positive staff interactions, school collaboration and team camaraderie.

Person Responsible: Milagro Arango (pr7361@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/15