

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Joe Hall 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Joe Hall Elementary School

1901 SW 134TH AVE, Miami, FL 33175

<http://joehall.dadeschools.net>

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Joe Hall Elementary community is to create a dynamic learning environment of the highest quality in which all students will acquire the knowledge, skills, and desire to become life-long learners and successful participants in the global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Joe Hall Elementary School is committed to providing students with exemplary instruction that will prepare them to become productive members of society in the 21st century.

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
Cruz, Yamberli	Principal	The principal is responsible for providing strong leadership and administration. Developing and implementing a school vision and mission. Managing school operations, budgets, and resources. Overseeing curriculum and instructional programs. Supporting and evaluating teachers and staff. Maintaining a safe and secure learning environment. Engaging with parents, families, and the community. Analyzing data and driving school improvement. Ensuring compliance with regulations and policies. Advocating for the needs of the school and students.
Aguiar, Zusel	Assistant Principal	The responsibilities of an assistant principal include assisting the principal in managing school operations. Supporting and evaluating teachers. Addressing student discipline and behavior issues. Engaging with parents and the community. Assisting in creating a safe learning environment. Collaborating with staff on curriculum and instruction. Assisting in administrative tasks and school events. Supporting emergency preparedness and safety measures.
Kelly, Georgina	ELL Compliance Specialist	Serve as an instructional leader and implementation of the school improvement plan. Engage stakeholders and encourage collaborations in the school's decision-making process.
Esquivel, Kelly	Teacher, ESE	Serve as an instructional leader and implementation of the school improvement plan. Engage stakeholders and encourage collaborations in the school's decision-making process.
Montes, Hilda	Other	The school counselor will assist the leadership team with the Attendance Action Plan.

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 Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) is the sole body responsible for final decision making at the school relating to the implementation of the components of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The EESAC's function is to bring together all stakeholders and involve them in decisions which affect instruction and the delivery of programs. EESAC reviews the school's performance on each accountability indicator, decides priorities through data analysis, and selects interventions.

SIP Monitoring

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

The school leadership team will obtain data, related to school improvement efforts, to share at EESAC, leadership and faculty meetings. The data points will be used to ensure continuous improvement towards standards mastery. School leaders will collect and share data monthly from classroom walkthroughs, student progress-monitoring exams, common planning minutes/input, staff feedback, parental and community input.

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	99%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	91%
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) 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	1	16	8	7	4	6	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	0	1	3	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	8	10	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	11	9	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	16	21	31	20	22	0	0	0	112

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	1	1	1	4	8	8	0	0	0	23

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	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	11	8	10	5	6	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	5	8	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	4	7	11	13	0	0	0	36

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	1	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	11	8	10	5	6	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	1	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	5	8	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	4	7	11	13	0	0	0	36

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	1	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	62	60	53	68	62	56	66		
ELA Learning Gains				72			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			61		
Math Achievement*	73	66	59	74	58	50	61		
Math Learning Gains				80			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			28		
Science Achievement*	57	58	54	54	64	59	48		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	67	63	59	57			48		

* 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	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	320
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	65

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	520
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	45			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	64			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	64			

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	45			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	65			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	66			

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	62			73			57					67
SWD	41			44			50				5	55
ELL	64			75			58				5	67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	62			73			57				5	67
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	60			71			59				5	74

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	68	72	50	74	80	65	54					57
SWD	35	59	54	45	55	50	15					44
ELL	64	72	50	71	85	80	47					57
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK												
HSP	67	72	50	74	80	65	55					58
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	69	74	50	75	81	65	57					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	66	61	61	61	31	28	48					48
SWD	38	41	50	38	27	27	26					46
ELL	67	63	77	57	34	27	43					48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	68	62	59	61	32	28	49					48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	66	61	67	59	30	29	46					48

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	59%	56%	3%	54%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	58%	-1%	58%	-1%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	55%	52%	3%	50%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	66%	63%	3%	59%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	64%	11%	61%	14%
05	2023 - Spring	67%	58%	9%	55%	12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	49%	50%	-1%	51%	-2%

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.

Proficiency for Joe Hall students on the 2023-2024 FAST Reading PM3 was 57%. This was better than the District's Reading proficiency of 51% and the State's Reading proficiency of 54% on the same assessment.

Proficiency for Joe Hall students on the 2023-2024 FAST Mathematics PM3 for was 70%. This was better than the District's Math proficiency of 54% and the State's Math proficiency of 58% on the same assessment.

Proficiency for Joe Hall students on the 2023-2024 Statewide Science Assessment was 49%. This was lower than the District's Science proficiency of 52% and the State's Science proficiency of 51% on the same assessment. Lack of science vocabulary and participation in essential labs is contributing to the school's lower proficiency level in science.

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

This was a baseline year for the new FAST assessment. However, both Reading and Math proficiency improved when comparing results from the 2022 FSA to the 2023 FAST PM3. There was a decline of 4 percentage-points in Science proficiency when comparing results from the 2022 and 2023 Statewide Science Assessment. Lack of science vocabulary and participation in essential labs is contributing to the school's lower proficiency level in science.

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.

When comparing Joe Hall's proficiency levels to the State's proficiency levels, the greatest gap is noted in 4th grade Mathematics. Grade 4 Math proficiency of 75% was 14 percentage-points higher than the State's Grade 4 Math proficiency of 61%.

The only negative gap when comparing to the State's proficiency levels was in Science. The school's Science proficiency of 49% was 2 percentage-points lower than the State's Science proficiency of 51%.

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

Mathematics proficiency showed the most improvement. This increase may be attributed to increased differentiated instruction, and the use of IXL Mathematics.

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

One area of concern is the number of students identified as having a "substantial reading deficiency." Out of 370 students enrolled, 112 students or 30%, have a substantial reading deficiency. Another area of concern is the number of students being retained in grade 3. Four students were retained in grade 3 while only three students were retained in Kindergarten, grade 1 and grade 2.

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

The highest priorities for school improvement are: 1) increased Reading proficiency, 2) increased Science proficiency and 3) increased attendance.

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 Intervention**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2023 FAST PM3 proficiency data, 57% of students are proficient in Reading. Since Reading is a foundational skill and less than half of the students tested demonstrated proficiency, we will implement the targeted element of Intervention to increase Reading proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If teachers implement Intervention, then Reading proficiency, learning gains and learning gains of the lowest 25% will each increase by 8 percentage-points on the 2024 Reading FAST PM3, by June 7th, 2024.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will conduct data chats, adjust intervention groups based on current data and follow-up with regular walkthroughs. Student intervention folders will be monitored for evidence of fidelity to program.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Yamberli Cruz (mrscruz@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 targeted element Intervention and evidence based instructional practice of Intervention will improve overall proficiency levels. Students will show increased scores in FAST, iReady, and ongoing progress monitoring assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Intervention program Reading Horizons helps students fill in foundational decoding skill gaps with assessment-driven explicit phonics instruction based on the principles of reading.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 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.

Utilize the district's intervention Decision Trees to articulate students. As a result, students will be identified for appropriate interventions.

Person Responsible: Yamberli Cruz (mrscruz@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17/23-9/29/23

Interventionists participate in professional development on delivering the RH Intervention program. As a result, teachers will deliver the Intervention curriculum effectively.

Person Responsible: Yamberli Cruz (mrscruz@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17, 2023

Schedule intervention time daily. As a result, teachers can follow the intervention pacing guide as written to facilitate delivery.

Person Responsible: Yamberli Cruz (mrscruz@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17/23-9/29/23

Provide teachers with student intervention folders. As a result, there will be evidence of program implementation to monitor student progress.

Person Responsible: Zusel Aguiar (zaguiar@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17/23-9/29/23

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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 Statewide Science Assessment 49% of 5th grade students were proficient in Science. On the 2022 Statewide Science Assessment 53% of 5th grade students were proficient in Science. This represents a 4-percentage point decline in Science proficiency. Based on the data, we will implement the targeted element of Student Engagement learning to increase proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of student-centered learning then 5th grade science proficiency will increase 8 percentage points by June 7th, 2024.

Monitoring:

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

The instructional practice of student-centered learning will be monitored by the administration. Lesson plans and student work will demonstrate participation in district provided Essential Labs and quarterly STEM lessons.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Yamberli Cruz (mrscruz@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Within the target element of Student Engagement, we will implement the evidence-based practice of student-centered learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The term Student-Centered Learning refers to a wide variety of educational programs, learning experiences, instructional approaches, and academic-support strategies (physical or virtual) that are intended to address the distinct learning needs, interests, aspirations, or cultural backgrounds of individual students and groups of students.

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.

Provide professional development for teachers in creating problem-based STEM lessons. As a result, students engage in quality STEM lessons that will increase proficiency in science.

Person Responsible: Yamberli Cruz (mrscruz@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17/23-9/29/23

Follow and execute district provided Essential Labs. As a result, students will participate in more student engagement and gain learning experiences that reinforce science standards and increase proficiency.

Person Responsible: Yamberli Cruz (mrscruz@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17/23-9/29/23

Implement quarterly STEM lesson plans. As a result student engagement and proficiency will increase.

Person Responsible: Yamberli Cruz (mrscruz@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17/23-9/29/23

Administer a science baseline assessment to students in Kindergarten through grade 5. As a result, deficiencies will be addressed in engaging lessons and labs.

Person Responsible: Yamberli Cruz (mrscruz@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17/23-9/29/23

#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 District/Tiered EWI report in Power BI, 12% of students at Joe Hall Elementary have chronic absence (missed 10% or more of school) in the 2022-2023 school year. We will implement the targeted element of Early Warning Indicators.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement Attendance Initiatives, the number of students with chronic attendance issues will decrease by 2 percentage-points as indicated in Power BI attendance reports by June, 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Student attendance will be monitored daily and intervention actions applied according to the Attendance Action Plan. The targeted student status form will be reviewed monthly to identify targeted students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Yamberli Cruz (mrscruz@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Within the targeted element of Early Warning Systems, our school will implement Attendance Initiatives. Attendance incentives will encourage students to attend school regularly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

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.

Implement the "ATTENDANCE IS COOL" incentive, as a result homeroom students will be encouraged to have perfect attendance.

Person Responsible: Zusel Aguiar (zaguiar@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17/23-9/29/23

Provide immediate feedback to parents regarding students' absences, as a result accountability will increase in parental awareness and support.

Person Responsible: Yamberli Cruz (mrscruz@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17/23-9/29/23

Provide an individual attendance incentive field trip, as a result the number of students with perfect attendance will increase.

Person Responsible: Yamberli Cruz (mrscruz@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17/23-9/29/23

Hold attendance review committee meetings for students with excessive absences and tardiness, as a result student truancy will decrease.

Person Responsible: Yamberli Cruz (mrscruz@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17/23-9/29/23

#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 2022-2023 School Climate Survey results, 50% of the teachers surveyed agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "I feel lack of concern/support from parents." This statement had a 35.6% increase from the previous year. Based on the data and the contributing factor of language barriers, we will implement the target element of Informed, Engaged, & Empowered Stakeholders.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of the evidence-based strategy of Family Engagement, there will be a decrease of 10 percentage points in teachers surveyed who agree or strongly agreed with the statement "I feel lack of concern/support from parents" as noted on the 2023-2024 School Climate Survey in May, 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Increased Family Engagement will be evident in the number of volunteers visiting the school to participate in activities, events and conferences. The administration will monitor the number of volunteer opportunities being offered for parents and will utilize the Raptor program to obtain a monthly count of parent volunteers and visitors to the school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Yamberli Cruz (mrscruz@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 at Joe Hall is focused on (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.

Family Engagement studies show that parent involvement is a major factor in student outcomes, including closing the achievement gap between various groups of students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The school will host a Meet and Greet event to create an initial contact between teachers and guardians. As a result, school families will experience an environment that's inviting and contact information will be exchanged to support communication throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Yamberli Cruz (mrscruz@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17/23-9/29/23

The school will utilize one platform, Class Dojo, for communication between the teachers and parents. As a result teachers may communicate with parents one-on-one or as a group to share individual student information or classroom activities. Once a parent connects to the teacher account, they can use the messaging service to message the classroom teacher anytime. Class Dojo also translates messages into the parent's preferred language.

Person Responsible: Yamberli Cruz (mrscruz@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17/23-9/29/23

The school will invite parents to attend Open House. As a result, families will be informed of academic goals for the year, will be provided information on how to obtain a volunteer number, will be provided their PIN number for Parent Portal access to increase family engagement.

Person Responsible: Yamberli Cruz (mrscruz@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17/23-9/29/23

The school will host a Parent Academy Workshop on The Parent Portal. As a result parents may use the portal to view their child's progress in school, including information on attendance. This type of family engagement will improve parental support and concern.

Person Responsible: Yamberli Cruz (mrscruz@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17/23-9/29/23

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 School Improvement Plan (SIP) is disseminated with stakeholders using regular channels of communication. The official plan is provided is available at <https://api.dadeschools.net/schoolwebsite/#!/?schoolId=2341> The SIP is communicated in a manner that is easily understood by the audience. The plan is shared in August during the opening of school faculty meeting, EESAC meeting, and Annual Title I Parent Meeting. Students are informed of the School Improvement Plan during morning announcements. These communications allow the leadership team to summarize the improvement plan and seek stakeholder support and engagement. The SIP is also available in the Title I Family Center.

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 Title I Family Engagement Plan for Joe Hall is available at <https://api.dadeschools.net/schoolwebsite/#!//?schoolId=2341> This plan promotes regular, two-way communication with school staff, activities that involve the student and engage the family in school activities, assistance to parents in understanding topics such as state academic standards, and a partnership between the school, parents, and the community to improve student academic achievement. Building positive relationships with school stakeholders can offer diverse perspectives and new ways of thinking about issues. It can also ensure that decisions made by schools are responsive to community needs.

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)

Title I funds will assist in strengthening the academic program at the school. Title I will provide supplemental instructional resources to support academic areas of focus such as Reading and Science. Title I will also provide resources to support attendance incentives, and parental involvement.

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

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: Intervention	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$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