Gulfstream Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Gulfstream Elementary School

20900 SW 97TH AVE, Cutler Bay, FL 33189

http://gulfstreamelm.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.

Gulfstream Elementary will provide an educational foundation for students to become productive members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Gulfstream Elementary will support and encourage children to develop their maximum potential and achieve success.

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
Iza-Rodriguez, Marlene	Principal	Ms. Iza-Rodriguez serves as an active member of the School Improvement Process ensuring that it is inclusive of all stakeholders and encompasses the needs of all students, teachers and the community.
Rogers, Marsha	Assistant Principal	Ms. Rogers serves as an instructional leader by ensuring that all stakeholders have the opportunity to provide input for our School Improvement Plan and that the School Improvement Plan addresses the needs of all students, teachers and parents within the school community.
Salinero, Alexandra	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Salinero serves as an instructional leader by ensuring that our general education population is receiving explicit instruction that will bridge gaps in student learning pushing students to their full potential.
Osborn, Mandy	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Osborn serves as a curriculum coach ensuring that our students are taught using the current standards and District-approved resources and that they receive the intervention and enrichment needed through differentiated instruction.
Levern, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	Ms.Levern serves as an instructional leader by ensuring that our general education population is receiving explicit instruction that will bridge gaps in student learning pushing students to their full potential.

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

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

The School Improvement Process is developed by the School Leadership Team. It is presented and reviewed quarterly by EESAC during meetings and faculty during faculty meetings. All stakeholders are provided with the opportunity to give feedback and the SIP is adjusted accordingly.

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 is revised quarterly to monitor the implementation of focus steps, evaluate for effectiveness, and to add additional action steps towards each area 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	95%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	23	26	23	18	16	23	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	11	19	24	7	9	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	0	5	11	14	7	4	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	13	17	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	15	17	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	18	31	40	30	17	23	0	0	0	159
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	4	8	15	25	15	20	0	0	0	87

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	8	10	7	11	4	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4

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	22	24	25	14	22	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	6	15	16	14	4	0	0	0	55
Course failure in Math	0	3	8	11	4	16	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	11	13	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	9	7	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	24	22	19	12	0	0	0	82

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	6	13	16	11	16	0	0	0	62

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	7	8	6	0	3	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	4

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	22	24	25	14	22	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	6	15	16	14	4	0	0	0	55
Course failure in Math	0	3	8	11	4	16	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	11	13	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	9	7	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	24	22	19	12	0	0	0	82

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	6	13	16	11	16	0	0	0	62

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
					Grade Level					
Retained Students: Current Year	0	7	8	6	0	3	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	4

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	50	60	53	56	62	56	47		
ELA Learning Gains				65			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63			33		
Math Achievement*	58	66	59	66	58	50	43		
Math Learning Gains				71			23		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				70			17		
Science Achievement*	51	58	54	53	64	59	41		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	69	63	59	60			59		

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	277
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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	504
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	45			
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	58			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	50			

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	57			

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	55			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	67			
HSP	64			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	42			
FRL	62			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	50			58			51					69
SWD	35			47			48				5	58
ELL	44			63			60				5	69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43			50			45				4	
HSP	53			62			57				5	69
MUL												

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
				2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS								
PAC												
WHT	44			56							2	
FRL	51			60			53				5	72

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
				2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS								
All Students	56	65	63	66	71	70	53					60
SWD	43	59	62	54	61	67	36					55
ELL	58	60	80	72	74	80	46					60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	52	67	60	70	77	82	60					
HSP	58	65	63	68	70	71	53					60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	46			38								
FRL	54	63	61	66	71	71	51					61

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
				2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS								
All Students	47	38	33	43	23	17	41					59
SWD	32	27	27	34	23	20	32					58
ELL	45	35		36	15		43					59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39	18		36	29		30					
HSP	50	45	42	47	23	18	45					59
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	45	35	25	40	23	19	40					59

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	47%	56%	-9%	54%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	58%	4%	58%	4%
03	2023 - Spring	38%	52%	-14%	50%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	63%	63%	0%	59%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	64%	3%	61%	6%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	58%	-1%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	50%	-5%	51%	-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.

Third grade through fifth grade reading results from the FAST PM3 showed the lowest performance overall declining from 54% to 50%, which is a 4 percentage point decrease from last year. This was a result of students adjusting to a new test and testing format (computer-based).

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

Third grade reading results declined from 61% on the FSA in 2022 to 38% on the FAST in 2023.That is a 23 percentage point decline. This was a result of having a new assessment, new testing format and incomparable testing from one year to the next.

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.

Compared to the state average of 50%, Gulfstream performed at 38% in third grade reading which is a significant difference of 12 percentage points. The factors that contributed to this difference include: new assessment and new format for assessment (computer-based).

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

Grade 5 reading data increased 3 percentage points from 44% in 2022 to 47% in 2023. New action steps included new personnel in 5th grade, collaborative planning sessions focused on standards aligned to lessons and consistent differentiated instruction activities within classrooms.

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

Two potential areas of concern are third grade reading at 38% and 5th grade math at 45%.

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

1. To increase overall reading proficiency in grades 3-5 by 7 percentage points.
2. To increase overall reading proficiency in grades 3-5 within the ELL subgroup by 10 percentage points.
3. To increase overall reading proficiency in grades 3-5 within the ESE subgroup by 10 percentage points.
4. To increase overall reading proficiency in grades 3-5 within the lowest 25 subgroup by 10 percentage points.
5. To increase science proficiency in grade 5 by 8 percentage points.

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.

According to the 2023 5th grade NGSSS science data, 45% of our general education students scored proficient as compared to 52% in 2022 indicating a decrease in 7 percentage points. Factors that contributed to this decrease were teacher/student absenteeism and inconsistency of instruction focused on science. In addition, our 5th grade standard ASD unit consisted of students who were all on Tier 3 intervention.

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

If teachers plan collaboratively and effectively deliver instruction focusing on standards-based instruction and engaging activities, our 5th grade NGSSS scores will increase by 5 percentage points on the NGSSS 2024 assessment.

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

This area of focus will be monitored during administrative team walk-throughs during science block, topic assessments, mid-year and end-of-year informal assessments and the 2024 NGSSS assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marlene Iza-Rodriguez (pr2321@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.)

Our evidence-based intervention is Collaborative Learning/Structures. Collaborative Learning/Structures is based on the theory that knowledge is a social construct. Collaborative activities are most often based on four principles: (1) the learner or student is the primary focus of instruction; (2) interaction and "doing" are of primary importance; (3) working in groups is an important mode of learning; (4) structured approaches to developing solutions to real-world problems should be incorporated into learning. Collaborative learning can occur peer-to-peer or in larger groups. Peer teaching/learning is a type of collaborative learning that involves students working in pairs or small groups to discuss concepts, or find solutions to problems. It enables learners to take responsibility for reviewing, organizing, and consolidating existing knowledge and material; understanding its basic structure; filling in the gaps; finding additional meanings; and reformulating knowledge into new conceptual frameworks. Learning from peers increases learning both for the students being helped as well as for those giving the help.

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

According to the 2022-2023 NGSSS data, 45% of the Fifth Grade general education students were proficient in science as compared to the 2021-2022 NGSSS scores where 50% of general education students were proficient. Based on the data, the identified contributing factors are: lack of fidelity in science instruction in k-4, student engagement, complexity of questioning during instruction, and student readiness levels limited the ability to master grade level tasks. We will implement collaborative learning for science to ensure student proficiency in the NGSSS.

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.

Professional development on Science benchmarks will be provided for K-4 science teachers. As a result, explicit instruction will be used throughout the grade levels creating a stronger base for our students in science.

Person Responsible: Marlene Iza-Rodriguez (pr2321@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14-September 29

A checklist will be used during walkthroughs and collaborative planning to include: pacing guides, science labs, the 5 Es and differentiated instruction (Edusmart). As a result, students will be teachers will be held accountable for implementing research-based strategies to improve planning and instruction.

Person Responsible: Marlene Iza-Rodriguez (pr2321@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14-September 29

The administrative team will conduct walkthroughs during the science block using the checklist to determine whether all components outlined are being implemented. As a result, the administrative team will become aware of future needs to strengthen instruction.

Person Responsible: Marlene Iza-Rodriguez (pr2321@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14-September 29

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

According to the 2023 ELA FAST data for grades 3-5, 52% of our students were proficient in 2023 as compared to 54% in 2022 on the FSA. That is 4 percentage point decrease. In addition, there was a decline of 23 percentage points on the 2023 third grade ELA FAST indicating 38% of our students are proficient as compared to 61% in 2022 on the FSA. This discrepancy is due to comparing two different tests.

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

According to the 2023 STAR and FAST data, we will implement small group instruction.

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

Small group instruction will be monitored during administrative team walk-throughs and observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marlene Iza-Rodriguez (pr2321@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 we will use is Flexible/Strategic Grouping. Flexible/Strategic Grouping includes informally grouping and regrouping students for a variety of purposes throughout the school day or during an instructional unit supports the learning of all students. Flexible grouping strategies are used to meet curricular goals, engage students, and respond to individual needs. Flexible grouping helps teachers overcome the disadvantages of ability grouping while still attending to individual performance issues. Both teacher-led and student-led groups will contribute to learning, but grouping decisions should respond to the dynamics inherent in each type of group. Teacher-led groups are the most common configuration—whole-class, small group, and individual instruction—and provide an efficient way of introducing material, summing-up conclusions from individual groups, meeting the common learning needs of a large or small group, and providing individual attention or instruction. Student-led groups take many forms, but share a common feature—that students control the group dynamics and have a voice in setting the agenda. Student-led groups provide opportunities for divergent thinking and encourage students to take responsibility for their own learning.

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

Based on the 2023 STAR/FAST data, we will implement small group instruction in order to bridge learning dificiencies.

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.

PM1 FAST data will be analyzed to determine grouping of students and needs. As a result, students' needs will be met.

Person Responsible: Marlene Iza-Rodriguez (pr2321@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14-September 29

Teachers will sort data to create instructional groups that are fluid based on on-going progress monitoring data from i-Ready, ELA progress monitoring and math topic assessment. As a result, students will receive instruction to meet their needs.

Person Responsible: Marlene Iza-Rodriguez (pr2321@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14-September 29

Teachers will develop lessons to implement during small group instruction based on students' individualized needs. As a result, lessons will be explicit and target each learner's needs.

Person Responsible: Marlene Iza-Rodriguez (pr2321@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14-September 29

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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

According to Power BI, in 2022-23, 56% of students were absent 11 or more days. In 2021-2022, 56% of students were also absent 11 or more days. This shows that our attendance remains stagnant. Contributing factors for a significant number of absences may stem from having a large number of students with disabilities/health concerns. In addition, some parents have become accustomed to keeping their child home with slight symptoms.

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

If student attendance is monitored on a daily basis and incentives are provided, our attendance will improve by 5 percentage points over the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Student attendance will be monitored on a daily basis by teachers and the attendance clerk. Teachers, the attendance clerk and our CIS will contact students who are exhibiting excessive absences on a daily basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Marlene Iza-Rodriguez (pr2321@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.)

Strategic attendance initiatives involve close monitoring and reporting of student absences, calls to parents, and more direct measures including home visits, counseling and referrals to outside agencies as well as incentives for students with perfect attendance.

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

Based on the data and the identified contributing factors such as doctors appointments during school time and parent work schedules, we will implement the attendance initiative.

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.

Analyze attendance data to identify patterns and trends of students with excessive absences. As a result, these students' attendance will be closely monitored and addressed to resolve situations before they worsen.

Person Responsible: Marsha Rogers (mhoover@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14-September 29

Identify students that were truant during the 2022-2023 school year and monitor on daily basis, contact families and provide support. As a result, parent contact will be made immediately preventing further unnecessary absences.

Person Responsible: Marsha Rogers (mhoover@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14-September 29

Celebrate and recognize students during the first nine weeks with perfect attendance, and encourage their peers to follow suit. Implement a reward system that incentivizes regular attendance, such as certificates, small prizes or special privileges. As a result, students will work towards being present which will increase their academic performance.

Person Responsible: Marsha Rogers (mhoover@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14-September 29

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

According to the Staff School Climate Survey, 66% of staff strongly agreed or agreed that they have "lack of concern/support from parents" at Gulfstream in 2022-2023 as compared to 13% in 2021-2022. This is a decrease of 53 percentage points. Possible contributing factors include parents busy work schedules and many of our ESE students do not live in the school community.

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

With the implementation of Family Engagement, no more than 50% of the staff will strongly agree or agree that there is a "lack of concern/support from parents" at Gulfstream by Spring of 2024.

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

Monthly sign-in sheets from parent activities and communication logs will be used to monitor desired outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marlene Iza-Rodriguez (pr2321@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.)

Family Engagement studies show that parent involvement is a major factor in student outcomes, including closing the achievement gap between various groups of students. Different families have different capacities for involvement, meaning schools should provide a range of ways for parents to be involved. Examples of Family Engagement activities include, but are not limited to, open houses, orientations, parent workshops, home visits, volunteer opportunities, and community events. The most important elements of a Family Engagement program are (1) creating genuine and collaborative relationships with families, (2) creating interactive sessions between staff and families, and (3) linking all interactions to learning to help build families' capacities in supporting their students' academic growth.

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

Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of lack of parent support and low number of school events, we will implement parent workshops and provide activities sponsored by the PTO and the school to increase parent involvement making them partners in the education of their child(ren).

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.

Parents will be invited to participate in an Opening of School Orientation. As a result, parents will be informed of school procedures and more likely to participate in activities in the future.

Person Responsible: Marlene Iza-Rodriguez (pr2321@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14-September 29

The school will communicate important information via the school website, social media, School Messenger, flyers and school marquee. As a result, all parents will be informed about important information and activities.

Person Responsible: Marlene Iza-Rodriguez (pr2321@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14-September 29

The school PTA will conduct a membership drive to include parents/guardians in school functions. As a result, more parents will participate in school activities.

Person Responsible: Marlene Iza-Rodriguez (pr2321@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14-September 29

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).

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

Based on the 2023 ELA FAST data for grades K-2, 33% of our students were proficient. Therefore, instructional practices related to improving Reading/ELA such as: small group instruction, differentiated instruction, scheduled intervention to meet with Tier II and Tier III students and common planning with grade level to share best practices will be beneficial in improving proficiency.

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

According to the 2023 ELA FAST data for grades 3-5, 52% of our students were proficient in 2023 as compared to 54% in 2022 on the FSA. That is 4 percentage point decrease. In addition, there was a decline of 23 percentage points on the 2023 third grade ELA FAST indicating 38% of our students are proficient as compared to 61% in 2022 on the FSA. This discrepancy is due to comparing two different tests. Therefore, instructional practice related to improving Reading/ELA such as: small group instruction, differentiated instruction, scheduled intervention to meet with Tier II and Tier III students and common planning with grade level to share best practices will be beneficial in improving proficiency.

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

Fifty percent or more of our students will score at the "proficient" level on the 2024 Star Literacy (F.A.S.T.) ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Fifty percent or more of our students will score a level 3 or higher on the 2024 F.A.S.T. ELA assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring

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

With the implementation of small group instruction, our K-5 students will increase proficiency by 20 percentage points by the 2024 STAR/FAST assessment. Small group instruction will be monitored by the leadership team during walk throughs and observations school-wide.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Iza-Rodriguez, Marlene , pr2321@dadeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The evidence-based intervention we will use is Flexible/Strategic Grouping. Flexible/Strategic Grouping includes informally grouping and regrouping students for a variety of purposes throughout the school day or during an instructional unit supports the learning of all students. Flexible grouping strategies are used to meet curricular goals, engage students, and respond to individual needs.

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?

Flexible Grouping helps teachers overcome the disadvantages of ability grouping while still attending to individual performance issues. Both teacher-led and student-led groups will contribute to learning, but grouping decisions should respond to the dynamics inherent in each type of group. Teacher-led groups are the most common configuration—whole-class, small group, and individual instruction—and provide an efficient way of introducing material, summing-up conclusions from individual groups, meeting the common learning needs of a large or small group, and providing individual attention or instruction. Student-led groups take many forms, but share a common feature—that students control the group dynamics and have a voice in setting the agenda. Student-led groups provide opportunities for divergent thinking and encourage students to take responsibility for their own learning.

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
August 14-September 29 Analyze PM1 FAST data to determine grouping of students and needs. As a result, students' needs will be met leading to increased proficiency.	Iza-Rodriguez, Marlene, mizarodriguez@dadeschools.net
August 14-September 29 Teachers will sort data to create instructional groups that are fluid based on on-going progress monitoring data from i-Ready, ELA progress monitoring and math topic assessment. As a result, students' needs will be met leading to increased proficiency.	Iza-Rodriguez, Marlene, mizarodriguez@dadeschools.net
August 14-September 29 Teachers will develop lessons to implement during small group instruction based on students' individualized needs. As a result, lessons will address students' needs leading to increased academic proficiency.	Iza-Rodriguez, Marlene, mizarodriguez@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 methods for dissemination of this SIP are the school website: gulfstreamelementary.net and through faculty and EESAC meetings.

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

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 by inviting parents into the school for workshops and activities.

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))

Gulfstream Elementary 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.

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 is developed in coordination and integration with other resources and programs under Title I such as VPK for students in pre-kindergarten (no fee), Title III for ELL learners to increase the acquisition of the English language, and Project Up-Start to assist parents and families with basic needs and resources.

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

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

The school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas by referring students to the counselor and the mental health counselor. In addition, students who have counseling on their IEP are seen as specified.

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

N/A

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

The implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services are provided to students in need.

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

Professional learning is offered to teachers, paraprofessionals and school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers.

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

Gulfstream has students in Pre-K visit kindergarten classrooms at the end of the year for transition exercises.

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: ELA	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$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.

Yes