Charles R Drew K 8 Center School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Charles R Drew K 8 Center

1775 NW 60TH ST, Miami, FL 33142

http://drew.dadeschools.net/

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Charles R. Drew K-8 Center is to recognize that each child is an individual, that all children are creative, and that all children strive to succeed. Our focus is to nurture growth, responsibility, and productivity; to embrace our diverse, multicultural population within a positive school-wide atmosphere. In doing so, we work toward an integrated curriculum that incorporates the art, forms of music, dance, drama and visual arts through hands-on experience and technology. Our students will be challenged to develop and achieve academics, school spirit, self-pride and community values through their talents, daily studies and educational accomplishments.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision at Charles R. Drew K-8 Center is to provide an academically stimulating environment that focuses on improving student proficiency in reading, math, science, and social sciences. We will capitalize on the power of collaboration amongst our staff, students, parents, and community partners to enhance our school and showcase the talents of our students in academics and the performing arts.

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
Volcy, Selena	Principal	The principal provides the mission and shapes the vision for academic success for all students. Establishes high expectations for students and staff. Conducts daily classroom walk-throughs to ensure fidelity to implementing the BEST Standards. Meets with the leadership team to utilize data to drive instructional decision-making. Communicates with parents and staff about attendance, engages the community, and allocates resources as needed.
Monica, Lisa	Assistant Principal	Works in collaboration with the principal to implement the vision and mission of the school. Ensures the fidelity of the MTSS process, monitors the implementation of tiered instruction, and meets with the leadership team to analyze and disaggregate Math and Social Studies data. Facilitate the alignment of professional development with faculty needs.
Goodman, Aurelia	Assistant Principal	Works in collaboration with the principal to implement the vision and mission of the school. Ensures the fidelity of the state assessments, monitors Title I implementation, and meets with the leadership team to analyze and disaggregate Math and Science data.
Kitchen, Ashley	Reading Coach	Provide direct ELA instructional services relating to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Utilizing the coaching model to support teachers with effective evidence-based instructional strategies to improve student academic achievement.
Joseph, Richelene	Science Coach	Provide direct Science instructional services relating to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Utilizing the coaching model to support teachers with effective evidence-based instructional strategies to improve student academic achievement.
Kleyla, Amanda	Reading Coach	Provide direct ELA instructional services relating to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Utilizing the coaching model to support teachers with effective evidence-based instructional strategies to improve student academic achievement.
Edwards, Juliet	Math Coach	Provide direct Mathematics instructional services relating to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Utilizing the coaching model to support teachers with effective evidence-based instructional strategies to improve student academic achievement.

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.

As a school community, all stakeholders, teachers, school staff, parents, and students, in collaboration with our leadership team and EESAC, identified areas of concern based on state assessment data from the 2022-2023 school year. Additional subgroups were selected for improvement based on the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) federal index to address low academic performance among Students with Disabilities (SWD), Hispanic (HSP), and English Language Learners (ELL).

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

Our school improvement plan will be monitored regularly for effective implementation and impact on the increasing achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards by the leadership team and monthly EESAC meetings. Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs and provide teachers with feedback, instructional coaches will support teachers in joint planning, and the leadership team will track student progress monitoring at quarterly data chats.

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-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	100%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
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	5	7	6	3	9	11	9	11	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	4	6	21	8	4	45
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	29	11	18	38	14	15	125
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	28	8	24	25	4	3	92
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	12	12	36	12	24	56	27	24	207
Retained students	0	0	0	17	0	0	1	0	0	18

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	0	26	9	21	31	8	9	104

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	17	0	0	1	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	6	11	13	6	22	22	15	24	119
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	24	4	42
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	7	2	5	8	2	2	27
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	0	22	45	23	22	125
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	3	15	54	13	15	110
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	3	28	4	24	40	29	26	154

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	2	13	2	19	47	24	22	129

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	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	4

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	6	11	13	6	22	22	15	24	119
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	24	4	42
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	7	2	5	8	2	2	27
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	0	22	45	23	22	125
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	3	15	54	13	15	110
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	3	28	4	24	40	29	26	154

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	2	13	2	19	47	24	22	129

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	4

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*	28	60	53	25	62	56	25		
ELA Learning Gains				40			29		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			26		
Math Achievement*	40	66	59	34	58	50	24		
Math Learning Gains				52			21		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			25		
Science Achievement*	40	58	54	27	64	59	21		
Social Studies Achievement*	71			72	71	64	45		
Middle School Acceleration	75			77	63	52	51		
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	20	63	59	70					

* 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	289
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	493
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	8	Yes	4	4
ELL	40	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	41			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

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	45			

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	31	Yes	3	3
ELL	34	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	40	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	47			

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	28			40			40	71	75			20
SWD	2			29			0				4	
ELL	45			55							3	20
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28			40			39	70	73		6	
HSP	38			44							2	
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												
FRL	27			38			36	73	79		6	

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	25	40	38	34	52	58	27	72	77			70
SWD	0	41	44	10	50	59	7	40				
ELL	20	10		20	50							70
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	40	40	33	53	59	26	73	81			
HSP	37	41		42	41		40					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	25	40	38	33	51	57	28	71	79			

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	25	29	26	24	21	25	21	45	51			
SWD	0	13	17	5	18	17	0	20				
ELL	25	40		50	50							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	27	22	24	20	22	19	42	48			
HSP	26	57		33	43							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	25	29	26	24	21	25	21	46	52			

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	26%	56%	-30%	54%	-28%
07	2023 - Spring	36%	50%	-14%	47%	-11%
08	2023 - Spring	41%	51%	-10%	47%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	26%	58%	-32%	58%	-32%
06	2023 - Spring	24%	50%	-26%	47%	-23%
03	2023 - Spring	13%	52%	-39%	50%	-37%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	29%	58%	-29%	54%	-25%
07	2023 - Spring	55%	48%	7%	48%	7%
03	2023 - Spring	20%	63%	-43%	59%	-39%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	64%	-16%	61%	-13%
08	2023 - Spring	80%	59%	21%	55%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	10%	58%	-48%	55%	-45%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	40%	40%	0%	44%	-4%
05	2023 - Spring	21%	50%	-29%	51%	-30%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	56%	37%	50%	43%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	52%	31%	48%	35%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	65%	35%	63%	37%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	68%	3%	66%	5%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance in proficiency across all grade levels was Reading when compared to last year, especially in grades 3 = 13% (-13%), 4 = 26% (-3%), and 6 = 23% (-8%). Contributing factors included a lack of consistent classroom modeling support from the K-5 transformation coach, teachers unfamiliar with new ELA BEST standards, and an interruption in instruction due to teacher vacancy (grade 5). Trending in a positive direction towards proficiency when compared to last year were ELA grades 5 = 26% (+17%), 7 = 36% (+5%), and 8 = 41% (+21%).

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

The data component which showed the most significant decline is Reading 3rd grade, with a 50% decrease in proficiency from the previous year resulting in 17 students for retention. Factors contributing to this decline include a lack of teacher modeling support of Tier 1 and Tier 2 effective instruction, classroom management, and inconsistent ESE support services.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component with the greatest decline compared to the states' PM3 FAST average was English Language Arts ELA. The breakdown reflects the following data:
Grade Level & State Average: 3rd = 50%, 4th = 58%, 5th = 54%, 6th = 47%, 7th = 47% & 8th = 47%
Grade Level & School Average: 3rd = 13%, 4th = 26%, 5th = 26%, 6th = 23%, 7th = 36% & 8th = 41%
Factors contributing to this gap resulted from ELA teachers needing support building their content

knowledge and a lack of direct teacher support (modeling effective instruction daily in ELA classrooms). Also, additional external support to start earlier could have assisted teachers with the support needed to improve instructional practices.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Mathematics. The actions taken were a complete revamping of the instructional focus with the assistance of two knowledgeable Curriculum Support Specialists working continuously with the administrator to build teacher capacity strategically. The math FAST data showed improvement in the following grades from the previous school year:
Grade and Math Average: 4th = 53% (+9%), 5th = 11% (+9%), 7th = 56% (+42%), 8th = 80% (+53%)
ALG = 93& (+18%), and GEO = 71% (+7%)
Additional actions were looking at Topic assessment data and identifying students for possible proficiency. We also created IFCs to remediate deficient standards during the foundations and research classes. We also incentivized students to attend tutoring and Saturday Academy. In Science, we also grew overall Science proficiency = 40% (+13%) and Biology performance = 100% proficiency. The actions included utilizing ETO instructional framework and resources and teachers attending PD to enhance their content delivery capacity, the Science coach developing targeted IFCs to remediate deficient benchmarks, conducting science intervention pull-out groups for targeted students, and incentivizing participation in extended learning opportunities.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, the two areas of concern are improving student performance in ELA and Math which scored a Level 1 on the FAST assessments.

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

The highest priorities for school improvement for the upcoming school year will include the following:
1. Identifying ELA teachers with strong reading content abilities
2. Make a personnel shift in the K-5 ELA transformation coach that has a background in transforming classroom instruction
3. Holding teachers accountable for student learning and ongoing progress monitoring
4. Provide teachers with professional development and coaching support in their content areas.
5. Improving family engagement to ensure academic support at home

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 Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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 22-23 FAST PM3 data, 12% of 3rd-grade students were proficient in reading compared to the state average of 50% and the district average of 52%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of lack of consistent classroom modeling support from K-5 coaches and a lack of teacher content knowledge, 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.

With the implementation of the targeted element of instructional coaching/professional learning, 30% of 3rd-grade students will achieve proficiency by May 2024, as evidenced by 23-24 FAST PM3 data.

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

The area of focus will be monitored via teacher professional development calendars, sign-in logs, surveys, agendas, observations, impact cycles, district site visits, data trackers, and administrative feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Monica (lmonica@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 strategy utilized is Job-Embedded Professional Development (JEPD). JEPD is teacher learning grounded in day-to-day teaching practice that consists of teachers assessing and finding solutions for authentic and immediate issues. It enhances teachers' content-specific instructional practices to improve student learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As a result of the implementation of the evidence-based strategy of Job-Embedded Professional Development (JEPD), we will be able to eliminate or decrease the achievement gap by enhancing teachers' content-specific instructional practices.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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: Provide ELA PD to teachers focusing on instructional delivery. As a result, teachers can implement effective Tier 1 instruction.

Person Responsible: Amanda Kleyla (331583@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

8/14-9/29: Coaches will monitor and track the effectiveness of the implementation of PD strategies using data trackers. As a result, coaches will be able to determine the next steps and identify opportunities for improvement.

Person Responsible: Ashley Kitchen (a.west@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

8/14-9/29: Coaches and teachers will implement the next steps of providing enrichment and remediation resources to target specific groups of learners. As a result, instruction will be tailored to the learner's needs.

Person Responsible: Juliet Edwards (jcolthirst-edwards@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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

According to the 2023 FAST PM3 data, 20% of 3rd-grade students were proficient in Math as compared to the state average of 50% and the district average of 52%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of many Level 1 and 2 students. The data reflects that student readiness levels limit the abilities to master grade-level tasks, and targeted remediation resources are not utilized effectively in meeting student needs; we will implement the Targeted Element of Differentiation.

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

With the implementation of scaffolded differentiated instruction, an additional 20% (for a total of 40%) of 3rd graders will score at grade level or above in the area of Math, an additional 23% in the area of ELA (for a total of 35%), an additional 15% in the area of science (for a total of 55%) by 2023-2024 FAST PM3 state assessments in May 2024.

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

The Leadership Team (principal, assistant principals, and instructional coaches) will conduct quarterly data chats, adjust groups based on current data in real time, and follow up with regular walkthroughs to ensure that differentiation is aligned with current data. Administrators will receive lesson plans for indication of differentiation. Data analysis of formative assessments will be reviewed monthly to observe progress. We will create an online tracker to monitor OPM data bi-weekly. This data will be analyzed during leadership Team meetings to ensure students demonstrate growth on remediated standards. Extended learning opportunities will be provided to those students who are not showing growth on OPMs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aurelia Goodman (relia1@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 differentiation, our school will focus on the Evidence-based Intervention of Scaffolding. Scaffolding will assist with gradually building the students' knowledge by planning with data in mind and meeting students where they are. Data-Driven instruction will be monitored using data trackers to drive instructional planning and data-driven conversations to include OPMs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Scaffolding is a teaching method that enables a student to solve a problem, carry out a task, or achieve a goal through a gradual shedding of outside assistance.

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: Provide Professional Learning for teachers on effective implementation of scaffolding aligned to relevant student data. As a result, teachers will identify appropriate resources for student success.

Person Responsible: Ashley Kitchen (a.west@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

8/14-9/29: Teachers will develop lesson plans that teachers will develop lessons that address students' needs. As a result, teachers will have student groups, appropriate resources, and lesson plans that reflect differentiation within whole group instruction as well as within small groups.

Person Responsible: Amanda Kleyla (331583@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

8/14/23: Teachers will attend weekly collaborative planning meetings to collaborate and brainstorm challenges, needs, and shared best practices. Teachers will take turns leading and modeling explicit instruction that addresses identified student needs. Strategies can include appropriate scaffolding, thinks aloud, and student questioning.

Person Responsible: Juliet Edwards (jcolthirst-edwards@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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, three ESSA subgroups were identified as missing the target Students with Disabilities (SWD), Hispanic (HSP), and English Language Learners (ELL) 32%. These students fell below the Federal Index of 41%. The 2023 FAST ELA proficiency data for Students with Disabilities (SWD) was 2%, English Language Learners (ELL) was 17%, and Hispanic students 17%. Based on the data, contributing factors include increased students scoring levels 1 and 2 on the FAST. Additionally, student readiness levels limit the ability to master grade-level tasks, and teacher lesson plans lack the ESE strategies and co-teaching support required to meet these students' needs. We will implement the Targeted Element of Collaborative Planning.

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

With the implementation of effective collaborative planning with the co-teaching model of support for these student subgroups, we should see a 21% increase in SWD, a 20% increase in ELL, and a 36 % increase in HSP students by May 2024, as evidenced by FAST PM3 data.

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

The leadership team (principal, assistant principal, and instructional coaches) will facilitate common planning and ensure ESE support strategies such as support facilitation are implemented with fidelity. Also incorporating the use of ELL technology resources based on student level and planning to address deficiencies. Additionally, in common planning addressing interventions for HSP students. Documentation with include agendas, lesson plans, professional learning opportunities, and ongoing progress monitoring will yield the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Monica (218283@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.)

If collaborative planning between the general education and ESE teacher is successfully implemented, the students will learn ESE and ELL strategies to routinely use routines to develop comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text. This recommendation aims to provide teachers with ways to support students in learning and practice routines and develop reading habits that enable students to understand what they are reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Within the Targeted Element of Collaborative Planning, instructional coaches provide teachers with ways to support students through research-based learning strategies while practicing routines and developing reading habits that enable students to understand their reading.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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: Provide professional learning for teachers on collaborative planning in which participants gain best practice strategies to address subgroup population needs. As a result, teachers will be equipped with resources to aid in addressing individual learners.

Person Responsible: Ashley Kitchen (a.west@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

8/14-9/29: Through familiar planning sessions, teachers will develop lesson plans that address students' needs. As a result, teachers will develop student groups and align instruction with targeted resources.

Person Responsible: Amanda Kleyla (331583@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

8/14-9/29: Teachers will attend weekly collaborative planning meetings to brainstorm and share best practices and challenges faced with implementing and delivering instruction. As a result, adjustments can be made to instructional delivery when needed.

Person Responsible: Juliet Edwards (jcolthirst-edwards@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

#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.

According to the 2022-2023 District/Tiered and Early Warning Indicators Comparison data in Power BI, 23% of our students have two or more referrals and 10% of our students were suspended from school. Additionally, 16% of our students attend school below 90% which is a direct indicator of their academic performance in which 28% of our students are ELA Level 1 and 21% of our students are Math Level 1. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors, student academic readiness levels are limited due to attendance and behavior. We will implement the Targeted Element of Early Warning Systems.

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 Systems, we can reduce the number of referrals by 10% (for a total of 13%), an additional 6% of our students can improve our attendance rates (for a total of 10%), an additional 10% in the ELA Level 1 (for a total of 18%), and 5% to decrease the number of suspensions (for a total of 5%) by June 2023.

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

The leadership team (principal, assistant principals, instructional coaches, counselors, and dean of discipline) will conduct quarterly progress monitoring meetings to plan and implement early warning systems intervention to assist students with attendance, academics, and behavior. Additional programs and opportunities will be provided to students not meeting the expectations outlined.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Selena Volcy (sauguste@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.)

With the Targeted Element of Early Warning Systems, our school will focus on the Evidence-based Intervention of Response to Early Warning Systems (EWS). Response to Early Warning Systems involves establishing a system based on student data to identify students who exhibit behavior or academic performance that puts them at risk of dropping out.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Response to EWS utilizes predictive data, identifies off-track or at-risk students, targets interventions, and reveals patterns and root causes.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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: Counselors will promote students' physical, emotional, and mental health through our student services team. As a result, students will have access to staff and resources to support their needs.

Person Responsible: Aurelia Goodman (relia1@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

8/14-9/29: Administrators will provide a schoolwide support system, such as proactive strategies for defining teaching and supporting appropriate student behaviors to create a positive learning environment. As a result, the school will be an effective environment in which teaching and learning occur.

Person Responsible: Selena Volcy (sauguste@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

8/14-9/29: Administrators will provide opportunities for parent involvement, such as Open House, Parent Orientation, Parent Workshops, Home Visits, volunteer opportunities, and community events. As a result, parent involvement will impact student outcomes.

Person Responsible: Lisa Monica (lmonica@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

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)).

Reviewing school improvement funding allocations and ensuring resources are allocated based on needs is a critical process to enhance educational outcomes. This process typically involves several key steps and considerations. The first step in reviewing funding allocations is to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment. This involves analyzing data on student performance, demographic information, and school-specific challenges. This data-driven approach helps identify where resources are most needed. After identifying needs, schools should set clear improvement goals. These goals should be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART). They serve as a roadmap for resource allocation. With goals in mind, a school or district develops a budget. This includes estimating costs associated with staffing, instructional materials, technology, professional development, and any other relevant expenses. It's crucial to consider equity throughout the process. Establish clear accountability mechanisms to track how funds are spent. Ensure that allocated resources are used for their intended purposes. This assists in ensuring that all students, regardless of their background, have access to the resources they need to succeed. Additionally, it is important to involve key stakeholders in the process which includes parents, teachers, and community members in the allocation process. It is also important to regularly review the budget and resource allocation to ensure they align with changing needs and priorities. Adjustments may be necessary to remain effective. There is also a need to implement a system for monitoring the impact of allocated resources on student performance and school improvement goals. Data should be collected and analyzed to assess whether funding is having the desired effect. Use the data collected to make informed decisions about resource allocation. If certain initiatives are not producing the desired outcomes, a reallocation of resources to more effective strategies may be needed. Additionally, allocation of funds for professional development to ensure that teachers and staff have the necessary skills to implement strategies effectively. In conclusion, reviewing school improvement funding allocations and ensuring resources are allocated based on needs is a multifaceted process that requires careful planning, data analysis, stakeholder engagement, and a commitment to equity. By following these steps and maintaining a continuous improvement mindset, educational institutions can optimize their use of resources to support student success and foster positive learning outcomes.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

Grades K-2: According to the 22-23 FAST PM3 data, 51% of kindergarten students, 26% of first-grade students, and 16% of second-grade students were proficient in reading. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of lack of consistent classroom modeling support and a lack of content knowledge from teachers, we will strategically develop explicit and systemic delivery and monitoring of Tier 1 instruction and implementation of DI with fidelity.

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

Grades 3-5: According to the 22-23 FAST PM3 data, 12% of third-grade students, 32% of fourth-grade students, and 27% of fifth-grade students were proficient in reading. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of lack of consistent classroom modeling support and a lack of content knowledge from teachers, we will strategically develop explicit and systemic delivery and monitoring of Tier 1 instruction and implementation of DI with fidelity.

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

With the implementation of the targeted element of instructional coaching/professional development and differentiation, 35% of K-2 students will achieve proficiency by May 2024, as evidenced by 23-24 FAST PM3 data.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

With the implementation of the targeted element of instructional coaching/professional development, 35% of 3-5 grade students will achieve proficiency by May 2024, as evidenced by 23-24 FAST PM3 data.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The area of focus will be monitored via teacher professional development calendars, sign-in logs, surveys, agendas, observations, impact cycles, district site visits, and administrative feedback.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Kleyla, Amanda, 331583@dadeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The evidence-based intervention strategy utilized is Job-Embedded Professional Development (JEPD). JEPD is teacher learning grounded in day-to-day teaching practice that consists of teachers assessing and finding solutions for authentic and immediate issues. It is designed to enhance teachers' content-specific instructional practices to improve student learning.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

As a result of the implementation of the evidence-based strategy of Job-Embedded Professional Development (JEPD), we will be able to eliminate or decrease the achievement gap by enhancing teachers' content-specific instructional practices.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
8/14-9/29: Provide ELA PD to teachers focusing on instructional delivery and monitoring student assessment data with trackers. As a result, teachers can implement effective Tier 1 instruction.	Monica, Lisa, lmonica@dadeschools.net
8/14-9/29: Coaches will monitor and track effectiveness of the implementation of PD strategies. As a result, coaches will be able to determine next steps and identify opportunities for improvement.	Kleyla, Amanda, 331583@dadeschools.net
8/14-9/29: Coaches and teachers will monitor and track student data. As a result, stakeholders will be able to determine the effectiveness of instruction, next steps and areas for improvement.	Kleyla, Amanda, 331583@dadeschools.net

Title I Requirements

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

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

To ensure that all students at Charles R. Drew K-8 Center receive a high-quality education and to close the achievement gap between children meeting the challenging State academic standards, this SIP is disseminated to all stakeholders at the monthly EESAC meetings.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Our school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders through family engagement opportunities, such as open house, parent orientation, parent workshops, home visits, volunteer opportunities, and community events. Through these family engagement opportunities, we will create a genuine and collaborative relationship with families, build positive interactions with staff and families, and link these interactions to build families' capacities in supporting their children's academic growth.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Our school plans to strengthen the academic program through research-based targeted elements such as data-driven decision-making, ongoing progress monitoring, student-centered learning, instructional support/coaching, extended learning opportunities, and deliberate practice.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Developing a school improvement funding plan that coordinates with various Federal, State, and local services, resources, and programs is crucial for comprehensive student support. This coordination ensures efficient resource use and holistic student development. Key considerations include, collaborating with Title I, II, and III offices, aligning the plan with federal requirements and goals through data sharing and regular meetings. To address violence prevention, it is important to involve law enforcement, mental health agencies, and community groups to create safer school environments by sharing data and common objectives. Ensure students have access to healthy meals, especially in low-income areas, by coordinating with nutrition programs and identifying students in need. Coordinate with early childhood education programs to ease transitions from pre-K to elementary school, sharing data on early learning experiences. Ensure school improvement plans align with (CSI) or (TSI) requirements through data sharing and collaboration with State agencies. Thus, steps for successful coordination include forming inter-agency committees for communication, sharing data to identify students eligible for multiple services, developing joint strategies and plans that maximize resources, aligning program objectives with the school improvement plan, regularly updating the plan to adapt to changing needs. By coordinating efforts across these programs, schools can create a seamless and supportive environment, addressing academic, social, and emotional needs comprehensively, ultimately improving student outcomes.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Our school ensures that counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, and mentoring services are provided to all students through our Student Services Programs. Our counselor, student support specialist, and mental health coordinator address academic, career, and social-emotional needs.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Our school is a Visual and Performing Arts Magnet with music, dance, and theatre programs.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We implement Positive Behavior Support (PBS) as a school-wide model for discipline. It includes proactive strategies for teaching and supporting appropriate student behaviors to create a positive school environment for all learners.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

We offer professional learning opportunities to our teachers and staff both throughout the district and at the school site. We incorporate common planning, instructional coaching support, and technology integration development.,

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

To prepare our VPK preschool students in the transition from early childhood education to local elementary programs with a comprehensive high-quality curriculum that provides kindergarten readiness skills.

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: Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No