

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Joella C. Good Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Joella C. Good Elementary School

6350 NW 188TH TER, Hialeah, FL 33015

<http://joella.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 and community believe that all students can and will learn. We accept the responsibility to prepare all students for mastery of positive social behaviors, attitudes and lifelong learning skills, that will elevate them to the world class standards necessary for success in a competitive world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The faculty and staff of Joella C. Good Elementary School envision a school where all learners are given multiple opportunities to develop lifelong skills that will enable them to be productive citizens in a global and technological world.

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
Torrens, Mileydis	Principal	The Principal oversees and manages instructional and operational aspects of the learning environments and school building.
Riol, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is an extension of the Principal to support the vision and mission of the school as well as collaborate with teachers parents and students to ensure student achievement.
Hinds, Juliette	Reading Coach	To generate improvement in reading instruction and reading achievement by conducting on-site, on-going literacy- related professional development; modeling best practices; assisting teachers in analyzing student performance data for differentiated instruction; and supporting school-wide progress monitoring programs.
Quigley, Donna	Math Coach	To generate improvement in math instruction and math achievement by conducting on-site, on-going related professional development; modeling best practices; assisting teachers in analyzing student performance data for differentiated instruction; and supporting school-wide progress monitoring programs.
Rodriguez, Elizabeth	ELL Compliance Specialist	To support instruction and educational programs for students whose home language is not English; ensure compliance with ELL documentation; provide resources/services to ELL students and teachers and parents of ELL students; monitor technological programs which assist ELL students with acquiring the language; monitor student progress on formative and summative assessments.
Pardo, Cynthia	Science Coach	To generate improvement in science instruction and science achievement by conducting on-site, on-going related professional development; modeling best practices; assisting teachers in analyzing student performance data for differentiated instruction; and supporting school-wide progress monitoring programs.
Alouidor, Sherry	Other	Support teachers in selecting professional growth target opportunities that will improve the overall learning and pedagogy. Propose professional development courses that are purposeful and target areas needing improvement.

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.

Stakeholders are an essential component of the learning community and providing feedback towards the School Improvement Process (SIP). Their input is provided through the Educational Excellence School Advisory Committee (EESAC) where components of the SIP are shared along with data to support the decisions made for continuous improvement. During the EESAC meetings, teachers, parents, students, and community business partners vote upon the components of the SIP and come to a consensus on additional action steps needed to support student achievement.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP 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, by engaging in an on-going data disaggregation process with stakeholders and correlating the achievements or lack of to the action steps outlined on the SIP. This will be done through grade level meetings, data chats, faculty meetings, and EESAC meetings. To ensure continuous improvement, the plan will be revised through analyzing what the areas of concern are and developing new implementation steps that will be purposeful in targeting the areas of focus.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	98%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) 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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A

School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	21	6	14	9	16	18	0	0	0	84	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	14	16	27	9	12	0	0	0	78	
Course failure in Math	0	6	11	12	26	38	0	0	0	93	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	48	34	37	0	0	0	119	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	28	23	0	0	0	70	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	34	26	26	56	42	44	0	0	0	228	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	6	6	32	31	37	0	0	0	112

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	1	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	7	15	12	12	11	0	0	0	57	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	12	16	27	20	9	0	0	0	84	
Course failure in Math	0	7	10	12	8	10	0	0	0	47	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	23	29	0	0	0	72	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	23	22	0	0	0	59	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	12	18	40	40	33	0	0	0	143	

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	13	12	22	21	24	0	0	0	92

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	14	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	43
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	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	0	23	6	14	7	16	0	0	0	66	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	2	11	22	19	9	0	0	0	63	
Course failure in Math	0	0	6	14	8	25	0	0	0	53	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	34	28	0	0	0	74	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	13	24	0	0	0	42	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	28	22	30	40	34	0	0	0	155	

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	4	17	20	26	0	0	0	69

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	68	60	53	69	62	56	65		
ELA Learning Gains				79			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62			45		
Math Achievement*	75	66	59	70	58	50	54		
Math Learning Gains				85			30		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				71			28		
Science Achievement*	65	58	54	61	64	59	58		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	75	63	59	58			65		

* 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	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	348
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	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	555
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	1	
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	67			
HSP	70			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	69			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	48			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	78			
HSP	67			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	68			

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	68			75			65					75
SWD	25			45			9				5	63
ELL	60			78			64				5	75
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	69			67			68				4	
HSP	68			77			64				5	75
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	67			74			64				5	75

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	69	79	62	70	85	71	61					58
SWD	28	60	71	33	68	64	18					39
ELL	62	73	57	72	85	70	50					58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	70	85	85	68	87	91	62					
HSP	68	76	58	71	84	64	59					58
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	68	78	65	68	84	71	55					56

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	65	53	45	54	30	28	58					65
SWD	33	33		15	19	30	29					60
ELL	58	52	44	47	36	35	52					65
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	63	40		52	13		53					
HSP	65	54	44	54	34	30	59					65
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80			70								
FRL	62	49	41	51	25	25	53					66

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	63%	56%	7%	54%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	58%	8%	58%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	52%	4%	50%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	71%	63%	8%	59%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	64%	7%	61%	10%
05	2023 - Spring	72%	58%	14%	55%	17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	59%	50%	9%	51%	8%

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 component showing the lowest performance was 3rd Grade ELA – Reading Across Genres: Interpreting Figurative Language. The contributing factors to last year's low performance was that the grade level expectations for that standard required clarifications due to the complexity of the question strands. The trends found were that this was a standard that students across grade levels struggled with mastery. Therefore, an emphasis on poetry and interpreting figurative language will be implemented from Kindergarten.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year was 3rd Grade ELA Proficiency from 67% in 2022 to 57% in 2023, a 10 percentage point decline. The factors that contributed to this decline was that there was a lack of foundational skills, especially as it relates to vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Students also need to have more exposure to making connections to the text and making inferences beyond answers that are “right-there” in the text.

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.

While all of the grade levels were above the state average as it relates to proficiency, 3rd Grade ELA was the area that was closest to the state’s proficiency average, School’s proficiency was 57% and State’s Proficiency was 50%. The factors why this proficiency was closest to the state’s proficiency was because we had an influx of students who are non-English speakers and did not have the language acquisition or academic vocabulary to be proficient on a standardized test. Although students did not make proficiency, students made significant gains from PM1 to PM3.

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

The data component showed the most improvement was 3rd Grade Math, from 62% proficiency in 2022 to 70% in 2023. The domain showing the greatest gain was of Number Sense and Additive Reasoning Performance. The contributing factors were the use of the state’s math transition document, correlation between the use of Big Ideas math series and the testing of topic assessments using Performance Matters to drive instruction, weekly usage of Reflex and IXL to support foundational skills needed to support proficiency, and the student engagement in lessons based on the data from the district-provided PPT and state’s practice tests.

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

The EWS data shows a need to improve the overall attendance percentage, with a focus on students that have 6-10 absences. The 2022-2023 data indicates that 29% of students were absent 6-10 times throughout the school year. This is a 1 percentage increase from the prior school year 2021-2022 with 28% of students being absent 6-10 times during the school year.

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

The highest priorities for school improvement for the upcoming school year is 2nd Grade and 3rd Grade ELA, specifically with student engagement and instructional delivery. The other focus will be implementing a school-wide science program so there is consistent science inquiry and investigations taking place from Kindergarten through fifth grade.

Area of Focus

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

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

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

According to the 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. PM3, 56% of 3rd grade students were proficient in ELA as compared to the 4th grade ELA proficiency rate of 76% and 5th grade ELA proficiency rate of 72%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of a high number of ELL students levels 1 and 2, student readiness levels in grades K-2, and a need for more standards-based instruction and assessments, we will implement the Targeted Element of Benchmark-aligned Instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to increase the ELA proficiency in grade 3 at least 3 percentage points on the FAST PM3 from 56% to 59%.

Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by having the Reading Coach plan with and support Reading teachers during instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Juliette Hinds (jhinds@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus is ensuring that students have exposure to foundational skills needed for comprehension. As a result, students will be able to attend i-Ready labs and tutorial programs focusing on the foundational skills in Reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this is so students can have a solid foundation and build upon the Reading skills necessary to have be able to read fluently and comprehend the text being read.

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.

Teachers will collaborate during the opening of schools meeting to review student data from the prior year to identify the area of focus for the incoming students for their respective grade level. Based on the disaggregation of data, teachers at each grade level will be able to better strategize the best practices and strategies needed in order to have purposeful and targeted lessons during their delivery of instruction.

Person Responsible: Mileydis Torrens (pr2181@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14, 2023

Teachers will engage in weekly collaborative planning to plan for end products for targeted ELA benchmarks. Based on the weekly collaborative planning opportunities, teachers will develop and execute lessons and assessments that are benchmark-aligned.

Person Responsible: Juliette Hinds (jhinds@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14, 2023- September 29, 2023

Teachers will engage in professional growth practices focusing on the clarifications of benchmarks and questioning skills to meet proficiency. Based on this, teachers will have a better understanding of what students' misconceptions are with specific benchmarks and will be able to better target their instruction and provide remediation opportunities for students.

Person Responsible: Juliette Hinds (jhinds@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 23, 2023

#2. 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 2022-2023 FCAT Science 2.0 assessment, 59% of 5th grade students were proficient in Science as compared to the 2021-2022 FCAT Science 2.0 assessment proficiency rate of 61%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of student readiness with science topics and the scientific process, we will implement the Targeted Element of Coaching Model.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to increase the Science proficiency at least 3 percentage points on the FCAT Science 2.0 from 59% to 62%.

Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by having the Science Coach plan with and support Science teachers during instruction and Science investigations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cynthia Pardo (cpardo17@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus is to have a strategic plan for Science where the Science instruction is supported by supplemental materials such as Discovery Education, Gizmos, and EduSoft, as well as, exposure to the scientific method and inquiry processes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting these strategies is that students will have an opportunity to explore the science topics in an innovative way and make connections to real-world experiences through the use of the scientific method.

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.

Build a Science lab which promotes scientific investigations. Based on having a Science Lab, teachers will be able to engage students in hands-on experiences which focus on the scientific method.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Pardo (cpardo17@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17, 2023

Engage in weekly collaborative planning to unpack and achieve understanding of grade level standards in Science. Based on the weekly collaborative planning teachers will be able to plan, deliver, and assess on science grade level content and reinforce the scientific method.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Pardo (cpardo17@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14, 2023 - September 29, 2023

Dedicate a faculty meeting to model for teachers how to provide students with hands-on science investigations using the scientific method. Based on this professional growth practice, teachers will be able to facilitate and support students in understanding the scientific method for purposes of the District's science fair.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Pardo (cpardo17@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 11, 2023

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2022-2023 PowerBI Student Attendance report, 29% of students in grades K-5 had 6-10 absences, compared to the 2021-2022 PowerBI Student Attendance report showing 28% of students in grades K-5 having 6-10 absences. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of parents not understanding the importance of attendance correlation to academic success, we will implement the Targeted Element of Attendance Incentive Program.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to decrease the percentage of students in grades K-5 with 6-10 absences by at least 3 percentage points from 29% to 26%.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by having a designated committee to monitor student attendance reports on a weekly basis to provide early interventions so students do not accumulate excessive absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tania La Torre-Perez (tlatorre@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus is to have the attendance review committee pull attendance reports and begin meeting with parents whose children have accumulated 3 total absences to identify resources to parents to ensure students are in attendance daily.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is so parents can be provided with the necessary resources so their children can attend school daily to obtain a quality education.

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.

Identify individuals which will serve on the Attendance Review Committee. Based on this, the committee will be able to closely monitor student attendance and develop attendance incentive programs.

Person Responsible: Tania La Torre-Perez (tlatorre@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14, 2023

Develop a school-wide attendance incentive plan. Based on the incentive plan, students will be motivated to attend school daily and will be rewarded for their attendance.

Person Responsible: Tania La Torre-Perez (tlatorre@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14, 2023 - September 29, 2023

Create an 100% attendance chart so teachers can track the class daily attendance in order to reward the students on a weekly basis if perfect attendance was achieved daily for that week. Based on this, students will feel motivated to come to school daily.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Riol (eriol5@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14, 2023- September 29, 2023

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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, 27% of teachers strongly agreed that they feel satisfied concerning how their career is progressing at this school, compared to the 2021-2022 School Climate Survey of 36% of teachers strongly agreeing that they feel satisfied concerning how their career is progressing at this school. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of teachers wanting to have more professional opportunities at the school, we will implement the Targeted Element of Career Satisfaction Opportunities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to increase the category of strongly agreeing to career satisfaction of teachers by at least 3 percentage points on the School Climate Survey from 27% to 30%.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by establishing career satisfaction opportunities by the Leadership team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Riol (eriol5@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus is to allow teachers opportunities to grow professionally so they can have a higher degree of motivation and satisfaction with their career at our school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is due to the fact that not all teachers strongly agree on the School Climate Survey that their career is evolving in the path desired.

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.

Create a survey related to career satisfaction. Based on the completion of the survey, the Leadership team will identify the areas in need of improvement so teachers can have more opportunities to grow professionally and obtain career satisfaction at our school.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Riol (eriol5@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14, 2023

A calendar of professional growth practices will be developed. Based on this, teachers will be able to engage in collaborative opportunities to grow professionally at our school.

Person Responsible: Mileydis Torrens (pr2181@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14, 2023- September 29, 2023

Assign teachers to go to the specified career satisfaction activity. Based on this, teachers will be able to collaborate with colleagues to find innovative way to continue improving their craft as teachers at our school.

Person Responsible: Mileydis Torrens (pr2181@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14, 2023- 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).

N/A

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 methods of dissemination of this SIP and SWP are having the information available to stakeholders at the School's Resource Center, making copies available at Open House, sharing the information through parent, faculty, and EESAC meetings, and posting them on our school's website joellacgood.org.

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 plans to build poitive 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 by having various family nights and multi-cultural activies embracing collaboration between the

home and school. The Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available through parent and community business meetings as well as through the school's website joellacgood.org.

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 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 by having focused collaborative planning sessions that focus on how to maximize the instructional time and addresses the diverse needs of the learners. Additionally, intervention and tutorial programs will be developed and offered to students needing remediation or enrichment.

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))

N/A