

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Earlington Heights Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>29</b>

# Earlington Heights Elementary School

4750 NW 22ND AVE, Miami, FL 33142

<http://earlingtonheightselem.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 staff, parents, and community of Earlington Heights Elementary School believe all students have the right and ability to learn. We are committed to providing a solid educational foundation for our students so they may achieve their highest academic potential, while maintaining steady, positive growth.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

All stakeholders of Earlington Heights Elementary School envision a learning environment that nurtures and encourages students to achieve their full potential as life-long learners who become productive citizens and leaders.

### 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
Nicolas, Jackson	Principal	As the school's principal, Mr. Nicolas provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. Data is utilized to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Mr. Nicolas establishes high expectations for all students and ensures that the school-based team is implementing a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS).
Cathey, Isahuri	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principal, Ms. Cathey works in collaboration with the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. Ms. Cathey ensures fidelity of the MTSS monitoring by evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development with faculty needs.
Floyd, Adriane	Reading Coach	As the reading coach, Ms. Floyd provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Ms. Floyd utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success.
Ramontal, Shahllynn	Reading Coach	As the reading coach, Ms. Ramontal provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Ms. Ramontal utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success.
Vargas, Romano	Math Coach	As the math coach, Ms. Vargas provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Mr. Vargas utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success.

**Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development**

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Leadership team met during Synergy to review data and feedback from Climate and Professional Development surveys. During the Opening of Schools meeting SIP Areas of Focus will be shared and feedback from teachers will be solicited during team-building activities. Open House for parents will include a SIP overview and discussion on steps that the school will be taking to focus on Areas of Improvement. During EESAC meetings SIP will be reviewed and feedback will be included during EESAC minutes.

**SIP Monitoring**

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

The School Leadership will review FAST data during faculty meetings after each administration. Data chats will be conducted during collaborative planning after each Topic Assessment and PMA to discuss Action Steps and make adjustments as needed. Intervention groups will be adjusted based on data and Transformation Coaches will plan for remediation. Review of data will occur after PM1, PM2, iReady Diagnostic 1/2 and after Topic Assessments.

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	99%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: A
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**Early Warning Systems**

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



Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	29	17	18	9	12	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	11	26	7	1	0	0	0	45
Course failure in Math	0	0	6	5	1	3	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	18	15	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	19	12	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	15	29	40	24	21	0	0	0	129

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	11	18	18	12	0	0	0	60

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	16	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	14	9	10	6	2	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	2	6	14	5	5	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	6	3	6	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	11	13	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	5	10	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	15	23	16	15	0	0	0	72

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	5	18	7	10	0	0	0	42

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	5	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	14	9	10	6	2	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	2	6	14	5	5	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	6	3	6	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	11	13	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	5	10	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	15	23	16	15	0	0	0	72

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	5	18	7	10	0	0	0	42

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	5	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	43	60	53	48	62	56	40		
ELA Learning Gains				59			34		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62			47		
Math Achievement*	62	66	59	72	58	50	54		
Math Learning Gains				81			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				73			60		
Science Achievement*	38	58	54	43	64	59	31		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	62	63	59	60			47		

\* 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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	236
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62

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	498
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	43			
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	47			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	49			

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	62			
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	63			
HSP	59			

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				
FRL	64			

**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	43			62			38					62
SWD	41			59			21				5	62
ELL	47			63							4	62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44			60			37				4	
HSP	43			65			40				5	62
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	43			61			39				5	71

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	48	59	62	72	81	73	43					60
SWD	46	62	75	66	80	70	35					62
ELL	44	56		68	75		33					60
AMI												
ASN												

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	46	59	67	73	81	69	49					
HSP	51	62		69	81		33					60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	48	61	65	73	82	76	43					62

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	40	34	47	54	49	60	31					47
SWD	26	44	55	49	78		38					
ELL	44	42		70	62		67					47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	33	50	51	44	50	20					
HSP	44	39		61	58		56					46
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	40	34	47	53	49	60	31					47

**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	46%	56%	-10%	54%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	58%	-14%	58%	-14%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	24%	52%	-28%	50%	-26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	34%	63%	-29%	59%	-25%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	64%	5%	61%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	58%	58%	0%	55%	3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	30%	50%	-20%	51%	-21%

### 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.**

Overall, the data component/grade based on the 2023 FAST results were 3rd grade Reading and Math. The students performed under 40% in both subject areas. Based on our discussions the following items were contributing factors to the low performance in grade 3. Students entering the grade level significantly below grade level based on AP1 and FAST PM1 data results. Students' inability to read and comprehend. Teachers' delivery of tier 1 instruction in ELA. Trends that have been observed are the ELA proficiency in 3rd grade has traditionally been below 40% proficiency.

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

Overall most grade levels only decline or increase a few percentage points when reviewing the same cohort of students from one grade level to the next. The data components that we feel showed the greatest decline from the prior year would be 5th grade Science from 43% in 2022 to 37% in 2023. A large number of students were almost at the level 3 ranking based on the data. Student timing/pacing during the assessment was a factor with our students. Also, math overall proficiency from 72% in 2022 to 65% in 2023. 3rd-grade math overall at 44% was significantly lower. 3rd grade math students were significantly low in reading with a 31% proficiency which interfered with their ability to complete the mathematics FAST assessment.

**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 that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average would be 3rd grade ELA. Earlington Heights Elementary School 36% versus the State's 50%. Based on our discussions the following items were contributing factors to the low performance in grade 3. -Students entering the grade level significantly below grade level based on AP1 and FAST PM1 data results. Students' inability to read and comprehend grade-level content. Teachers' delivery of tier 1 instruction in ELA.

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

Our 4th-grade students showed the most improvement in ELA from 36% in 2022 to 55% in 2023. The improvement was also evident in 4th-grade math with an increase from 77% in 2022 to 82% in 2023. Contributing factors were student engagement with teachers. The teachers looped with students and established relationships, and knowledge of learners, and cultivated a family atmosphere that allowed the students to succeed in and out of the classroom.

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

An area of concern for our school is student attendance. This year we have seen a major drop in our daily student attendance. Unfortunately, we were unable to fulfill the counselor position this year which we feel did contribute to the consistent monitoring and follow-up of student attendance.

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

1. Our highest priority is 3rd-grade teacher/student support, schedules, and instructional planning geared towards improving students' phonics, reading comprehension, and math fluency.
2. Building teacher capacity of new standards, delivery, and planning of tier 1 instruction in ELA.
3. Support to ESE and ELL students in all grade levels.
4. Additional, hands-on lessons in the area of science in all grade levels.

**Area of Focus**

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



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to 2023 English Language Arts data, grade three students scored 31% proficiency on the FAST Progress Monitoring 3, as compared to the state at 50% and the district at 51%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of students' lack of foundational skills, and fidelity to standard align instruction during Tier 1 delivery.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

With the implementation of Benchmark-aligned Instruction, we will increase 7% points from 31% to 38% in Grade 3 English language Arts on the FAST PM3.

**Monitoring:**

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

The leadership team will conduct bi-weekly walkthroughs to review work products to ensure completion. In addition, Transformation Coaches will conduct weekly collaborative planning which will focus on Benchmark-aligned instruction. Data will be analyzed by the coach and teacher to identify if standards were mastered.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Isahuri Cathey (icathey@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 strategy will be effective questioning and response techniques. In order to ensure effective questioning and response techniques the teacher and coach will plan effective questioning for before reading, during reading, and after reading. In addition, the teacher and coach will collaborate to develop response techniques.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By developing effective questioning and response techniques, teachers will have a clear gauge on students' understanding of Benchmark aligned instruction.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 2 - Moderate 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.

During weekly collaborative planning, transformation coaches will use 15 minutes to review Daily End Products (DEP's) in Reading Writers Workshops and students journals to monitor students mastery.

**Person Responsible:** Shahlynn Ramontal (sramontal@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** September 5-29, 2023

During the first month of school, the Transformation Coach will conduct a Coach Teacher Collaboration to plan, model, co-teach, and provide feedback to the teacher on effective Benchmark-aligned lessons.

**Person Responsible:** Shahlynn Ramontal (sramontal@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** August 28-September 29, 2023

During the first month of school, the ELA leadership team will conduct two walk throughs to analyze work products to ensure completion of Benchmark-aligned lessons.

**Person Responsible:** Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** September 5-29 2023

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****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 Math data, grade three students scored 44% proficiency on the FAST, as compared to the state's average of 59%, and the district's average of 63%. Due to a lack of foundational knowledge, coupled with lack of understanding of new BEST benchmarks during tier 1 instruction, and missed opportunities for tier 2 academic instruction.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

With better understanding of grade three BEST benchmarks, support from the transformation coach, expectations of small group instruction during tier 1/tier 2 instruction, we will anticipate a 10% increase from the previous year's 44% to a 54% on the FAST PM3 for grade three math.

**Monitoring:**

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

The transformation coach will model and monitor the GRRM during tier I instruction, and conduct immediate data analysis after topic assessments to analyze data with teacher(s) to develop tier II support plans. The leadership team will conduct bi-weekly walkthroughs to ensure evidence of the gradual release model within the workbooks.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Romano Vargas (ra\_vargas1@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 strategies will be the Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model (GRRM) and data-driven decision making. Utilizing the GRRM, math coach and teacher will scaffold instruction and chunk questioning to aid in comprehension of benchmarks and enable independent learning. Utilizing data-driven decision making, coach and teacher can better plan for intervention.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By implementing the GRRM, scaffolded instruction will aid in developing a foundational understanding of content and enable independent learning. Utilizing data-driven decision-making, the coach and teacher can better identify and plan for intervention beyond the 60-minute math block.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

The transformation Coach will model for grade 3 math teachers the Gradual Release of Responsibilities during tier 1 instruction with a focus on teacher-directed instruction

**Person Responsible:** Romano Vargas (ra\_vargas1@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** September 5-8, 2023

The transformation coach and grade 3 math teacher will conduct immediate data analysis after topic assessments to identify benchmarks for differentiated instruction resources.

**Person Responsible:** Romano Vargas (ra\_vargas1@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** September 11-13, 2023

The transformation coach will model differentiated instruction beyond the 60-minute framework based on data analysis from topic assessment.

**Person Responsible:** Romano Vargas (ra\_vargas1@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** September 11-15, 2023

The leadership team will conduct a bi-weekly walkthrough to ensure consistent implementation of the Gradual Release of Responsibilities by examining student workbooks.

**Person Responsible:** Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** September 11-30, 2023

**#3. 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 2022-2023 School Climate Survey, 36% of staff members did not agree that adequate disciplinary measures are used to deal with disruptive behaviors. Due to a lack of social-emotional learning, character development, and fidelity to classroom behavior systems.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

With the development of a staff-driven school-wide behavior plan, the use of character development, and positive behavior systems, we anticipate a 10% decrease.

**Monitoring:**

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

The assistant principal will monitor the PowerBI discipline dashboard and the number of students invited to the positive behavior celebration.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Isahuri Cathey (icathey@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 strategy will be character education and values matter. This will enable our students to develop and enhance their ethical, moral, social, emotional, and academic skills.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Educating our students on character development and values matter will enable them to develop needed social skills which in turn will decrease the frequency of disruptive behaviors.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

The leadership team will discuss reasonable rewards and consequences for commonly observed behavior and update the school-wide behavior plan.

**Person Responsible:** Shahlynn Ramontal (sramontal@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** September 5-15, 2023

Teachers will conduct two-morning meetings a week to discuss the values matter and IB learner profile. Monday's meeting will be an introduction and Friday morning will be a reflection and followup.

**Person Responsible:** Maya Herran (3387726@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** September 1-30, 2023 On Mondays

The IB coordinator will send out a monthly survey to identify students, in each homeroom class, who have displayed the values matter traits. Students will be recognized on our morning announcement and receive a certificate and gift bag.

**Person Responsible:** Shahlynn Ramontal (sramontal@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** September 11-30, 2023 (On a monthly basis throughout the year)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science****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 Science data, grade five students scored 37% proficiency compared to 42% in 21-22. Due to a lack of a deep understanding of topics and background science knowledge.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

With the implementation of hands-on experiments and students' writing analysis, grade five students will improve Sunshine State Assessment science proficiency from 37% to 42%.

**Monitoring:**

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

The Leadership Team will conduct bi-weekly walkthroughs to ensure evidence of hands-on experiments, weekly formative assessments, and end-of-topic writing analysis.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Isahuri Cathey (icathey@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 strategy will be effective questioning and response techniques. This will allow the fifth-grade teacher to assess the mastery of the topic.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By implementing effective questioning and response techniques it will promote critical thinking through hands-on experiments, and provide weekly checks for understanding using district-provided graphic organizers and end-of-topic writing analysis.

**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.

Pre-plan and conduct hands-on experiments during collaborative planning for Topics 1 and 2 prior to the beginning of the topic.

**Person Responsible:** Jordan McFarlane (333946@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** August 28-September 30, 2023

During collaborative planning, the fifth-grade math teacher and assistant principal will conduct a product review of hands-on experiment writing analysis.

**Person Responsible:** Jordan McFarlane (333946@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** September 7-30, 2023

The fifth-grade teacher will plan to develop appropriate questioning techniques for all learners (ESOL/ ESE). The use of visuals will be utilized to prompt students during questioning.

**Person Responsible:** Jordan McFarlane (333946@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** September 5-25, 2023

### **CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review**

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

N/A

## **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**

The area of focus will be intervention with a focus on instructional delivery and student engagement. This will affect students by building foundational skills in the areas of phonemic awareness, phonological awareness, phonics, and high-frequency words. Based on 2023 FAST Star Progress Monitoring three, students in kindergarten through grade two scored an average of thirty-six percent which falls below the goal of fifty percent in all components of reading. These students are not on track to score within the fiftieth percentile and have been labeled tier two and tier three.

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

The area of focus will be standard-aligned instruction with an emphasis on student engagement. This will affect students by building vocabulary and comprehension skills, enabling fifty percent of students to score a Level Three or higher on the FAST Progress Monitoring Three. Based on 2023 FAST progress monitoring three, students in grades three through five scored an average of forty-eight percent which falls below the goal of fifty percent.



## 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

Students in Kindergarten through Grade two will score an average of fifty percent on all components of the FAST Star Early Literacy and Star Reading Progress Monitoring Three

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Grade three through five students will score an average of fifty percent or higher proficiency on the 2024 FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment.

## 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.

Intervention instruction focused on instructional delivery and engagement will be monitored through the use of research-based instruction, bi-weekly walkthroughs, and product reviews during collaborative planning. Standard-aligned instruction focused on student engagement will be monitored through weekly collaborative planning, bi-weekly walkthroughs, and product reviews.

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Floyd, Adriane, 260876@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 practice for kindergarten through grade 2 will be intervention with a focus on instruction delivery and student engagement. Intervention will address foundational skills (phonological awareness, phonemic awareness, high-frequency words, and comprehension). The evidence-based practice for grades three through five will be a collaborative learning structure with a focus on engagement. A collaborative learning structure will address deep comprehension and higher-order thinking.

**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?

Based on 2023 FAST Star Early Literacy and Star Reading, an average of sixty-four percent of students in kindergarten through grade two did not meet proficiency. This is a direct link to the lack of foundational skills. Reading Horizons is an evidence-based intervention system that uses the science of reading to address foundational skills. This will enable our students to acquire the needed foundational skills needed to become fluent readers and proficient on state assessments. In addition, third through fifth grade data shows that fifty-two percent of students did not meet proficiency. Collaborative learning structures will aid in increasing the proficiency percentage in that it allows students to articulate their thinking, share knowledge and deepen discussions. McGraw Hill Wonders series is a reading program aligned to the BEST standards and will be use to enrich their vocabulary, deepen their comprehension and higher level of thinking.

**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
The Transformation Coach will deliver professional learning to all kindergarten through grade two intervention teachers and interventionists on the core four of the reading horizon program. September 25, 2023	Ramontal, Shahlynn, sramontal@dadeschools.net
The Transformation Coach will identify all Tier 3 and Tier 2 students based on PM1 and create schedules to ensure students are receiving the appropriate interventions based on student needs. September 11-15, 2023	Ramontal, Shahlynn, sramontal@dadeschools.net
The Transformation Coach will provide training on a collaborative planning structure that will enhance student engagement and in turn increase student achievement/ engagement. September 5-8, 2023	Floyd, Adriane, 260876@dadeschools.net
The Transformation Coach will collaborate once a month with grade four and five ELA teachers to share best practices that have been shown to be effective. August 28-September 29, 2023	Floyd, Adriane, 260876@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.

Title I school dissemination of SIP will be provided to parents via Parent Handbook, school website, Title I Annual Meeting, EESAC, and by parents visiting the Title I Resource area in the Attendance Office.

**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))

Title I school dissemination of SIP will be provided to parents via Parent Handbook. Information regarding Title I resources throughout the school year. Our school website, Title I Annual Meeting, EESAC, and parents visiting the Title I Resource area in the Attendance Office.

**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)**

As a school, we will strengthen our academic program by supporting teachers and students through the use of modeling, planning, and development by Transformation Coaches. After School programs will focus on Tier 1 instruction and remediation of the lowest standards in reading and math. Interventionists will be used to provide small-group support.

**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))**

As a school we will strengthen our academic resources and programs through the use of Head Start and Federal support.

### **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 is ensuring counseling services on a daily basis through the use of school counselor, mental health coordinator and social worker. Students are referred based on needs and receive either individual counselling or group counseling.

**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))**

Since we are in an elementary school setting, we currently provide after school opportunities.

**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).**

Our school provides all students with the districts Code of Conduct and teachers use various means to review school rules with all students. Students receive tier 2 interventions by the use of our mental health support team.

**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))**

School staff engage in data chats, weekly planning sessions to review data and align resources to student needs.

**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))**

Students participate in transition sessions with family and students. We have meetings with parents and students. Students are able visit kindergarten classes.

## 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: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>

### Budget Approval

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

No