

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Benjamin Franklin K 8 Center School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	25
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	30

Benjamin Franklin K 8 Center

13100 NW 12TH AVE, North Miami, FL 33168

<http://benfranklinelem.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 Benjamin Franklin K-8 Center is to develop global leaders of tomorrow. We serve the community by modeling healthy habits and helping our students develop the ability to become effective lifelong learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Benjamin Franklin K-8 Center's school vision statement is to cultivate a transformational learning experience where teaching and learning opportunities will be connected with past experiences, which will lead to critical reflection and thinking for all students.

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
Loubeau, Diana	Principal	To uphold and supervise the educational, cultural, and operational systems of the Benjamin Franklin K-8 Center's learning community.
Pratt, George	Assistant Principal	To assist the Principal of Benjamin Franklin K-8 Center in overseeing and implementing the overall operations and academic requirements, ensuring effective adherence to the policies of Miami-Dade County Public Schools. Additional duties involve monitoring specific faculty and staff and ensuring the faithful implementation of curriculum resources.
Blackshear, Michelle	Reading Coach	To assist the Pre-K through 8th grade faculty at Benjamin Franklin K-8 Center in implementing the ELA, Writing, Intensive Reading, and Intervention curriculums and offering varying forms of support such as: coaching cycles, peer mentoring, professional learning opportunities, and the use of appropriate instructional resources and strategies to undergird academic success.
Corbitt , Andre	Math Coach	To facilitate the advancement of the Mathematics instructional curriculum within Benjamin Franklin K-8 Center, we extend our support to the Kindergarten through 8th-grade math department. This comprehensive support encompasses various strategies, including coaching cycles and the provision of supplementary academic resources, aimed at elevating the overall quality of the student learning experience.
Fortune, Myrtha	Science Coach	To enhance the educational endeavors of Benjamin Franklin K-8 Center, our commitment extends to providing comprehensive support to the Kindergarten through 8th-grade faculty and support staff in the implementation of the science instructional curriculum, encompassing Biology EOC. This support framework encompasses a range of strategies, including coaching cycles and the provision of supplementary academic resources, all aimed at enriching the overall student learning experience.

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.

In the School Improvement Plan (SIP) process, active engagement of all stakeholders is paramount. This inclusive approach involves faculty, staff, students, and community leaders. We will actively seek feedback from these key stakeholders through faculty meetings, student surveys, and ESSAC meetings, where parents and community leaders participate. The collaborative efforts of the school leadership team will be instrumental in synthesizing and analyzing the data collected.

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 Improvement Plan (SIP) will undergo vigilant monitoring on a bi-weekly basis during leadership team meetings, with a primary focus on reviewing student achievement data. The school leadership team will harness these insights to inform discussions with stakeholders during ESSAC and faculty meetings. This collaborative input will play a pivotal role in fine-tuning strategies and enhancing student performance on standardized assessments.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	99%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
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	4	4	3	8	8	4	8	5	3	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	1	1	20	1	10	0	0	1	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	6	14	8	8	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	12	16	33	21	21	131
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	28	12	13	24	12	9	98
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	23	10	19	34	14	23	51	41	36	251

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	3	30	11	13	20	10	10	97	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	11	1	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	5

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	5	8	9	4	10	11	18	16	36	117	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	4	2	16	18	48	88	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	23	9	15	4	0	0	1	52	
Course failure in Math	0	0	6	4	14	15	1	0	0	40	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	16	27	24	25	34	145	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	20	25	28	22	31	147	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	25	21	21	41	30	24	31	195	

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	8	20	21	24	27	24	42	166

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	14	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2

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	5	8	9	4	10	11	18	16	36	117	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	4	2	16	18	48	88	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	23	9	15	4	0	0	1	52	
Course failure in Math	0	0	6	4	14	15	1	0	0	40	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	16	27	24	25	34	145	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	20	25	28	22	31	147	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	25	21	21	41	30	24	31	195	

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	8	20	21	24	27	24	42	166

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	14	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2

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*	40	61	53	40	62	55	34		
ELA Learning Gains				57			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			34		
Math Achievement*	49	63	55	41	51	42	19		
Math Learning Gains				79			27		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				78			38		
Science Achievement*	60	56	52	43	60	54	32		
Social Studies Achievement*	74	77	68	70	68	59	43		
Middle School Acceleration	97	75	70	95	61	51	56		
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	65	62	55	63	75	70	51		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	422
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	612
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	20	Yes	4	1
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	61			
HSP	50			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	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%
SWD	34	Yes	3	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	61			
HSP	58			

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	61			

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	40			49			60	74	97			65
SWD	23			16							2	
ELL	27			45			37	74			6	65
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42			50			58	74	96		7	67
HSP	32			42			64				4	61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	40			48			57	73	95		7	66

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	40	57	46	41	79	78	43	70	95			63
SWD	14	38	19	17	56	58	23					50
ELL	27	55	48	36	78	75	27	60				63
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	36	54	46	41	79	79	42	67	100			64
HSP	52	67	42	43	79	70	50					57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	40	56	44	41	80	77	41	71	94			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	34	40	34	19	27	38	32	43	56			51
SWD	6	28	40	6	25	36	8					38
ELL	26	35	38	15	26	43	26	42				51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	39	35	17	24	35	28	44	50			51
HSP	46	45		29	45		62					50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	34	40	34	19	27	38	32	44	56			51

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	49%	56%	-7%	54%	-5%
07	2023 - Spring	36%	50%	-14%	47%	-11%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	34%	51%	-17%	47%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	60%	58%	2%	58%	2%
06	2023 - Spring	30%	50%	-20%	47%	-17%
03	2023 - Spring	33%	52%	-19%	50%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	43%	58%	-15%	54%	-11%
07	2023 - Spring	49%	48%	1%	48%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	26%	63%	-37%	59%	-33%
04	2023 - Spring	54%	64%	-10%	61%	-7%
08	2023 - Spring	55%	59%	-4%	55%	0%
05	2023 - Spring	55%	58%	-3%	55%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	47%	40%	7%	44%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	41%	50%	-9%	51%	-10%

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

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	72%	68%	4%	66%	6%

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 lowest performing data component from the Spring 2023 administration of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) was middle grades English Language Arts (ELA), specifically sixth grade. Sixth grade ELA students scored at 29% proficiency. The factor's contributing to last year's low performance in grade six include: a teacher new to the grade level, a lack of instructional coaching, instructional delivery, student engagement, and a teacher vacancy when the same group of students were in grade five. A trend identified is the insufficient performance of middle grades ELA on the Spring 2022 administration of Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) and the Spring 2023 administration of FAST.

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

The greatest decline in student data from the 2022 Spring Administration of the FSA to the Spring 2023 administration of FAST is middle grades ELA. According to the Spring 2022 FSA (Florida State Assessment) middle grades proficiency data, in comparison to the Spring 2023 FAST PM3 data, 6th Grade ELA (English Language Arts) decreased from 37% to 29%, 7th Grade went from 41% to 37%, and 8th Grade went from 37% to 33%. The contributing factor's to the decline in performance include: a teacher vacancy in 8th grade ELA, inconsistent instructional coaching opportunities due to the teacher vacancy in 8th grade ELA, and the past performance of 6th graders while in grade five.

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 gap when compared to the state is ELA, specifically 6th grade ELA. The state average amongst 6th graders throughout the state was 47% proficiency. Whereas, Benjamin Franklin K-8 Center's 6th graders performed at 29% proficiency. The factor's contributing to last year's low performance in grade six include: a teacher new to the grade level, a lack of instructional coaching, instructional delivery, student engagement, and a teacher vacancy when the same group of students were in grade five.

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

The data component with the greatest improvement is Mathematics. According to the data obtained from the Spring administration of FAST. Math proficiency in 3rd-8th grades increased from 41% on the Spring 2022 FSA to 53% on the 2023 Spring FAST PM3 resulting in a 12 percentage point increase. The new actions taken that brought about this increase included consistently tracking data, celebrating success, small group instruction, and the use of a math interventionist to remediate prerequisite skills.

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

The potential areas of concern identified by the Early Warning System are the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency (195), and the number of students absent for 10 or more days (117).

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

1. Number of students with substantial reading deficiencies.
2. Attendance
3. Middle grades ELA
4. 3rd grade Mathematics
5. 3rd grade ELA

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 Collaborative Planning**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.

Forty-two percent of students in grades three through eight scored at proficiency on the Spring 2023 administration of FAST. However, only 34% of students in grades six through eight scored at proficiency compared to the 51% of students scoring at proficiency in grades three through five. ELA teachers in grades six through eight did not have access to an instructional coach from November 2022 to June 2023. This was a contributing factor to the difference in performance between ELA's elementary and middle grades. Additionally, the elementary transformation reading coach was not available to coach grade three until November 2023 and experienced frequent disruptions in the collaborative planning schedule thereafter. As a result, we will implement collaborative planning to ensure that we meet our goal.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The implementation of consistent data driven decision making during collaborative planning with instructional coaches and teachers this will result in an improvement of at least 7 percentage points on the 2024 Spring administration of FAST. That is an increase from 42% to 49%.

Monitoring:

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

Administration and/or the leadership team will monitor this area of focus by attending collaborative planning sessions, reviewing collaborative planning agendas, progress monitoring student data on topic assessments and FAST PM1 and PM2, reviewing teachers' lesson plans, and conducting weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of items discussed and lessons planned during collaborative planning sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

George Pratt (304513@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention that will be utilized at Benjamin Franklin K-8 Center will be data-driven decision making. Data-driven decision making has been selected with the specific intent of ensuring that all academic decision-making is purposeful. Our aim here at Benjamin Franklin K-8 Center is to position all stakeholders in the best possible circumstances to achieve academic success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data-Driven Decision Making is a process embedded in the culture of the school where data is used at every level to make informed decisions on what is best for students. This includes goal setting, interventions, teacher placement, course work, differentiating instruction etc.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

From August 2023 to September 29, 2023, Teachers in grades 1-4 and 6-8 will participate in collaborative planning sessions with the transformation coach weekly while teachers in grades K and 5 will participate monthly. As a result, the transformation reading coach and teachers in grades K-8 will collaborate to determine the pacing, practices, and resources to be used for effective classroom instruction.

Person Responsible: Michelle Blackshear (chelleblack@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

From August 2023 to September 29, 2023, the transformation reading coach and teachers in grades K-8 will collaborate weekly or monthly to analyze data from the Fall administration of FAST and iReady AP 1. As a result, transformation coach and teachers will be able determine areas of need, develop DI groups, and plan appropriate responses to the derived data.

Person Responsible: Michelle Blackshear (chelleblack@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

From August 2023 to September 29, 2023, the transformation reading coach and teachers in grades K-8 will collaborate weekly or biweekly. As a result, transformation reading coach and teachers will be able to select appropriate resources for effective standard aligned and engaging lessons in both whole group and small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Michelle Blackshear (chelleblack@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

#2. 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 data Math proficiency in 3rd-8th grades increased from 41% from the Spring 2022 FSA to 53% on the 2023 Spring FAST PM3 resulting in an 12 percentage point increase. However, according to the 2023 FAST PM3, 3 grade levels did not reach the 50% Proficiency mark: 3rd Grade 26%, 6th Grade 42% and 7th Grade 48%. The contributing factors to this performance data is do to teachers being to to the grade level and lack of staff causing instructional coach to cover a class. The plan is to improve the proficiency of the students in their subsequent grades by implementing Instructional Coaching/ Professional Learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The implementation of Job-Embedded Professional Development, will result in an improvement of at least 10 percentage points on the Spring 2024 Math FAST PM3 administration. This will be an overall increase of entering 4th grade Math students from 26% to 36%, 6th grade Math students from 42% to 52%, 7th grade Math students from 48% to 58% proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

Math Transformation coach will plan collaboratively with teacher and determine instructional resources that will be used during instructional support and conduct professional development to build the capacity of the teachers. The assistant principal will monitor this area of focus by conducting weekly walkthroughs to ensure implementation of instructional coaching and professional learning is occurring with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

George Pratt (304513@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention that will be utilized at Benjamin Franklin K-8 Center will be Job-Embedded Professional Development. Job-Embedded Professional Development, has been thoughtfully chosen to ensure that all stakeholders remain well-informed about areas of deficiency and those requiring supplementary support. This strategic approach facilitates informed decision-making, enabling the precise selection of tools and interventions necessary to bridge these gaps and foster academic success among our students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Job-Embedded Professional Development (JEPD) refers to teacher learning that is grounded in day-to-day teaching practice and is designed to enhance teachers' content-specific instructional practices with the intent of improving student learning. It is primarily school or classroom based and is integrated into the workday, consisting of teachers assessing and finding solutions for authentic and immediate problems of practice as part of a cycle of continuous improvement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

From August 14th - September 29th, teachers and the transformation coach for middle grades will collaborate to determine academic deficiencies. As a result, instructional practices, student engagement strategies, proficiency concerns and areas of instructional coaching and professional development will be determined to better meet the needs of teachers to improve student proficiency on FAST assessment.

Person Responsible: Andre Corbitt (acorbitt@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

From August 14th - September 29th, teachers and the transformation coach for grade 3-5th will meet to determine deficiencies. As a result, instructional practice, student engagement strategies, proficiency concerns and areas of instructional coaching and professional development will be determined.

Person Responsible: Andre Corbitt (acorbitt@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

From August 14th - September 29th, Transformation Math coach will conduct mini professional development via collaborative planning. As a result, teachers will have a better understanding of the instructional framework for better use of the instructional block for 3rd -8th grade.

Person Responsible: Andre Corbitt (acorbitt@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

During the 2022-2023 school year, it was noted that 39% of our staff were absent between 5 to 10 days according to PowerBi School Improvement Plan (SIP) data. The contributing factor to this was teacher illness and mental health and lack of teacher motivation. As a result of data, we will focus on Teacher Attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of positive rewards/incentives for attendance, we will decrease the number of staff absences with 5-10 days by 10 percentage points from 39% to 29%.

Monitoring:

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

At Benjamin Franklin K-8 Center, we will monitor this area of focus by reviewing the staff sign-in application for attendance in addition to following up with our school's sub-locator to verify attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

George Pratt (304513@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 chosen evidence-based intervention to be employed is the utilization of rewards and incentives. The selection of this approach is grounded in the objective of fostering a welcoming and appreciative atmosphere for teachers here at Benjamin Franklin K-8 Center. By implementing rewards and incentives, we aim to not only acknowledge teachers contributions but also create a warm and inclusive environment. This in turn, is expected to have a positive impact on teacher attendance and promoting a culture of engagement and commitment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rewards/Incentives refers to a school's leadership team creating rewards and incentive programs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

From August 17- June 1, 2024, school-wide quarterly incentives for staff members with the best attendance average will be implemented to promote increased staff attendance. As a result, teacher absences will decrease by 10 percentage points.

Person Responsible: George Pratt (304513@dadeschools.net)

By When: June 1, 2024

From August 17- June 1, 2024, school-wide attendance challenges will be implemented to promote increased staff attendance. As a result, teacher absences will decrease by 10 percentage points.

Person Responsible: George Pratt (304513@dadeschools.net)

By When: June 1, 2024

From August 17- June 1, 2024, names of staff members with perfect attendance will be added to the "All About the Benjamins" bulletin board monthly and will be shared during our monthly faculty meetings. As a result, teacher absences will decrease by 10 percentage points.

Person Responsible: George Pratt (304513@dadeschools.net)

By When: June 1, 2024

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to Spring 2023 FAST English Language Arts data, there were only 22% of our SWD's in the area reading and 25% in the area of mathematics that demonstrated proficiency. Based on this data and this contributing factor, we will focus on SWD's being identified as a critical need. The contributing factor to this data was the staff being utilized in different areas to support teacher vacancies including SPED teachers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Ongoing Progress Monitoring at Benjamin Franklin K-8 Center, we plan to achieve an increase of 5% points in the area of proficiency for both ELA and Mathematics students within our SWD's population on the FAST PM3 assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored via progress monitoring data from the FAST assessment, bi-weekly assessments, and diagnostics from i-Ready. The leadership team will also conduct targeted walkthroughs ensuring that individual and class data trackers are current and that lesson plans are aligned to current benchmarks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

George Pratt (304513@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 of Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) currently in use to target SWD's aimed at addressing the lowest benchmarks, complemented by collaborative planning sessions with an emphasis on aligning instructional practices with standards for this subgroup.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) is used to assess students' academic performance, to quantify a student rate of improvement or responsiveness to instruction, and to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction. OPM can be implemented with individual students or an entire class.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

From August 14th - September 29th, teachers and the transformation coach for grades 3-8th will meet to determine SWD's IEP's and accommodations. As a result, teachers will be able to understand and meet the needs of students with disabilities.

Person Responsible: Michelle Blackshear (chelleblack@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

From August 2023, to September 29, 2023, the transformation in the area of reading and mathematics will collaborate biweekly with teachers in grades 3-8 focusing on SWD's. As a result, transformation coaches and teachers will be able to select appropriate resources for effective standard aligned and engaging lessons in both whole group and small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Andre Corbitt (acorbitt@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

From August 2023, to September 29, 2023, administration will have specific look for walkthroughs of grades 3-8 classes focusing on SWD's small group instruction and the use of OPM data to drive instruction. As a result, SWD's data will increase by 5% points on FAST assessment data.

Person Responsible: George Pratt (304513@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 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).

Upon receiving our school's data, our leadership team meets to discuss and target our area(s) of focus. Once the area(s) of focus are identified, our team decides what materials and/or interventions are needed to improve each identified area. This information is then shared with teachers and our EESAC for additional input and/or recommendations. Once all information is culminated and agreed upon, teachers are then provided with a targeted student list in addition to the required supplies and support needed to implement programs with consistency and augment instructional delivery.

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

Data from the 2023 Spring administration of STAR shows that 31% of kindergarteners scored at or above the 50th percentile, 45% of 1st graders scored at or above the 50th percentile, and 29% of 1st graders scored at or above the 50th percentile. That totals only 35% of students in grades K-2 scoring at or above the 50th percentile. Based on the data and contributing factors of teachers new to the profession and new to the grade level, we will implement instructional practices relating to Reading/ELA.

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

Data from the Spring 2023 administration of FAST shows the following proficiency rates: grade 3-37%, grade 4-65%, grade 5- 50%. That was an overall proficiency average of 51% in grades 3-5. Small group instruction requires that teachers identify areas of weakness through data analysis and informal observations and reteach or remediate in a small teacher lead group. Based on the data and contributing factors of teachers new to the profession and new to the grade level, we will implement instructional practices relating to Reading/ELA

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

The implementation of Differentiated Instruction will result in an increase of at least 45% of students scoring at the 50th percentile or above on the Spring 2024 administration of the STAR ELA Progress Monitoring Assessment. Thereby improving our targeted proficiency rate by 10 percentage points from 35% on the Spring 2023 administration of STAR to 45% this school year.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The implementation of Differentiated Instruction will improve student performance on the Fall 2024 administration of FAST ELA PM3 by 10%. Thereby placing our targeted proficiency rate for grades 3-5 at 61% from last years rate of 51%.

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.

Differentiated Instruction will be monitored by both the transformation reading coach and administration by conducting walkthroughs, reviewing lesson plans, reviewing student artifacts, reviewing trends in McGraw-Hill Progress Monitoring Assessment data, and teacher/ student data chats. This will result in at least a 10 percentage point improvement in students scoring at proficiency. That will be an overall proficiency rate of 45% or higher in grades K-2 on the Spring administration of STAR. Monitoring will also result in 61% of students in grades 3-5 scoring at proficiency on the Spring Administration of FAST.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Pratt, George , 304513@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?

Classroom teachers with assistance from the reading transformation coach will determine areas of need for differentiated instruction by analyzing data from formal assessments and/or informal classroom observations. Teachers and the transformation coach will then use the data and/or observed behaviors to plan for and implement differentiated instruction. The content, process, and/or product will be differentiated based on students' instructional needs. Selecting differentiated instruction is the varying instructional needs of students. Differentiated instruction allows classroom teachers to meet the needs of all learners by differentiating the content, process, and product as needed.

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?

Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of: acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability. Research demonstrates this method benefits a wide range of students.

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
From August 2023 to September 29, 2023, the transformational reading coach and classroom teachers will identify students' areas of need by analyzing data derived from the Fall 2023 administration of FAST STAR PM 1 and the Fall IReady diagnostic assessment AP1. As a result, teachers will be able to group students according to their areas of need so that teachers can better meet their academic needs.	Blackshear, Michelle , chelleblack@dadeschools.net
September 2023 - May 2024: Each week during collaborative planning sessions classroom teachers and the transformation reading coach will determine appropriate standard-aligned lessons to fill learning gaps, reteach previously taught skills, scaffold, and/or enrich current spotlight benchmarks. As a result, teachers lessons and instructional delivery will be better aligned to meet the academic needs of students.	Pratt, George, gpratt3@dadeschools.net
September 2023 to May 2024: Classroom teachers will track students' performance on skills taught during and the effectiveness of differentiated instruction using data trackers. As a result, student individualized academic needs will be better meet and increase student proficiency of FAST/STAR assessment.	Blackshear, Michelle , chelleblack@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.

The information within our School Improvement Plan (SIP) and Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) will be effectively communicated to all stakeholders through various channels, including faculty meetings, leadership team meetings, ESSAC (Educational Support and School Advisory Council) meetings, and prominently featured on the school website at bfk8tigers.wixsite.com/benfranklink8.

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))

The school is committed to establishing a nurturing and positive relationship with parents, families and other community stakeholders as an integral part of fulfilling our mission. To achieve this goal, we will ensure that all parties are well-informed through regular weekly Connect Ed messages. Additionally, we will strive to create a welcoming and supportive environment, delivering exceptional customer service in person and maintaining an active presence on our multiple social media platforms to engage and connect with our community.

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)

The school is dedicated to enhancing the academic program by implementing a structured approach. This involves instructional coaches participating in monthly coach meetings, facilitating weekly collaborative planning sessions between instructional coaches and staff members, and conducting weekly data chats within the leadership team. These initiatives aim to foster a culture of continuous improvement and effective support for our students and educators.

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))

This plan has been developed with careful consideration of various programs and initiatives. The overarching objective is to ensure that all stakeholders are well-informed and in alignment with the multifaceted components in place, all working in a harmoniously towards the shared goal of enhancing student success on the state standardized FAST Assessment.

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: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Attendance	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$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