

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Hialeah Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>11</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>16</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>25</b> |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>25</b> |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>28</b> |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>0</b>  |

# Hialeah Elementary School

550 E 8TH ST, Hialeah, FL 33010

<http://hes.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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>ESSA 1116(b-g) |                        |

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

## **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

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

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

The staff, parents, and community of Hialeah Elementary believe that all students can learn and achieve mastery of fundamental skills. Together we will strive to develop each student's academic, social, physical and emotional potential, thus creating productive citizens in our multi-cultural and changing world.

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

We are committed to providing educational excellence to all students, while ensuring that it is also a happy, safe, welcoming and supportive learning environment.

### 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  |
|----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Iglesias, Rosa       | Principal           | To lead and guide the school and oversee the activities and daily operations within the school. In addition, job duties and responsibilities include but are not limited to; facilitating and collaborating with all stakeholders while overseeing curriculums and above all ensuring that the school environment is safe for all students and staff members. Inclusive of the job is to work within the given budget, hire, evaluate, and observe instructional staff and encourage staff members and support parental involvement. |
|                      | Assistant Principal | Under the direction of the Principal, the AP assists the principal in planning, coordinating and directing the activities and programs related to curriculum, staff and students. The AP also observes and evaluates teachers and provides viable feedback to assist in improving instruction. In addition, the AP handles discipline, schedules, testing and is knowledgeable about all educational programs that the school adheres to.  |
| Wagner, Natalie      | Reading Coach       | Collaborates with educators and school administrators to follow curriculum and lesson planning. The reading coach also works with administrators to set goals with teachers and serve as advocates for the literacy program. In addition, the reading coach also mentors new teachers and provides intervention for selected students that are in need of additional support. The reading coach also attends reading curriculum meetings and provides support to ensure all mandated instruction is taking place.                    |
| Rijo, Miriam         | Math Coach          | The primary role of the math coach is to support best practices in using data to drive instruction and to assist and work directly with classroom teachers to improve student learning of mathematics and to provide academic support. The math coach is also aware of the most current teaching practices and keeps the math teachers abreast of what is mandated by the Math Department.   |
| Patterson, Shanna    | Teacher, K-12       | S. Patterson works closely with all 2nd and 3rd grade teachers. She supports them all with overall school-wide information and resources. She meets weekly to collaborate with both grade levels to ensure effective instruction.  |
| Menendez, Maria      | Teacher, PreK       | M. Menendez serves as a teacher leader for the primary teachers and prepares and plans with teachers for effective instruction that supports all learners. She specifically focuses on working and supporting Pre-K, 1st and Kindergarten teachers with school-wide information, planning and activities.  |
| Fernandez, Katherine | Teacher, K-12       | 4th grade teacher Math and Science teacher. She is also the new school-site PD Liaison.  |

### Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The School Leadership Team meets continually throughout the school year to update and address the needs of the school according to recent data collected. Primarily, the key stakeholders that represent the school are identified, this includes; administrators, the school leadership team, parents and community members. Next, clear communication of the expectations and input involving the stakeholders will be discussed while developing the plan. Additionally an engagement plan will be implemented with stakeholders as we look at data collected, parent, staff and student surveys conducted within the last school year. High consideration will be given to common concerns that affects our school academically. Firstly addressing the learning loss, lack of academic growth and lack of achievement, and the mental well being of all staff and student members. The action plan developed will be based on identified priorities that will be goal specific with strategies to monitor and timelines for improvement. The stakeholders will be informed throughout this process through grade level meetings, faculty meetings, leadership meetings and regularly scheduled EESAC meetings. Involving our stakeholders will be a continuous process that will require open communication and collaboration to ensure the school's growth and success.

### SIP Monitoring

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

The School Improvement plan will be specifically written to address weaknesses that have been identified and will be closely monitored throughout the year to make sure that results from regular assessments, baseline testing and progress monitoring is given our undivided attention. Guidelines from the district and professional development will have to match the needs of our teachers and students while addressing what can be done better. Data analysis, and teacher feedback will be a priority as well while addressing specifically the students that have the greatest achievement gap. Targeted interventions and progress tracking will be implemented with fidelity and this may involve additional support if available and use of approved resources. Open and ongoing communication with all stakeholders will be key to ensuring that needs are being met and that progress is being made. Our school will review the plan regularly to discuss progress, share insights and make necessary modifications to the plan. Additionally, improving communications as a whole will provide needed feedback to adjust strategies and to maintain collaboration among stakeholders so that the School Improvement Plan can effectively address the achievement gap among students. Special attention through ELL resources will have to be adhered to so that we will also meet the needs of our influx of newcomers.

### Demographic Data

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

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)                | Active                    |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |



|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | Yes  |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 100%   |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 100%   |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No   |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | ATSI   |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>English Language Learners (ELL)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  | 2021-22: B<br><br>2019-20: A<br><br>2018-19: A<br><br>2017-18: A   |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |  |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>   |  |

### Early Warning Systems

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |     | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |     |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 17          | 15 | 11 | 8  | 5  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59  |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |     |       |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 9  | 6  | 4  | 8  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 9  | 1  | 14 | 13 | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 64 | 59 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 183 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 57 | 39 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 35          | 54 | 76 | 69 | 65 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 368 |       |

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 | 2           | 8 | 2 | 51 | 37 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137   |

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     | 3           | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1     |

**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           | 17 | 15 | 7  | 7  | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58  |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |     |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 2  | 14 | 12 | 6  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 2  | 7  | 5  | 3  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 17 | 22 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 11 | 25 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 5  | 23 | 46 | 32 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 |       |

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           | 4 | 11 | 19 | 18 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78    |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 6 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2  | 2 | 0 | 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           | 17 | 15 | 7  | 7  | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58  |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |     |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 2  | 14 | 12 | 6  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 2  | 7  | 5  | 3  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 17 | 22 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 11 | 25 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 5  | 23 | 46 | 32 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 |       |

**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           | 4 | 11 | 19 | 18 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78    |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 6 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2  | 2 | 0 | 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*            | 53     | 60       | 53    | 59     | 62       | 56    | 52     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 68     |          |       | 58     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 49     |          |       | 50     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*           | 54     | 66       | 59    | 59     | 58       | 50    | 42     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 80     |          |       | 39     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 73     |          |       | 57     |          |       |

| Accountability Component        | 2023   |          |       | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                                 | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement*            | 49     | 58       | 54    | 37     | 64       | 59    |        |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     |        |          |       |        | 71       | 64    |        |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      |        |          |       |        | 63       | 52    |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        |          |       |        | 53       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          | 80    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    | 58     | 63       | 59    | 55     |          |       | 54     |          |       |

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

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

#### ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |      |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 53   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 2    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 263  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 5    |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100  |
| Graduation Rate                                |      |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |      |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 60   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 480  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 8    |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100  |
| Graduation Rate                                |      |

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

| <b>2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b> |  |                           |  |  |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b>                      | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
| SWD                                       | 30                                     | Yes                       | 2  | 1  |
| ELL                                       | 50                                     |                           |  |  |
| AMI                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| BLK                                       | 30                                     | Yes                       | 1  | 1  |
| HSP                                       | 54                                     |                           |  |  |
| MUL                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| PAC                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| FRL                                       | 50                                     |                           |  |  |

| <b>2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b> |  |                           |  |  |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b>                      | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
| SWD                                       | 38                                     | Yes                       | 1  |  |
| ELL                                       | 58                                     |                           |  |  |
| AMI                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| BLK                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| HSP                                       | 60                                     |                           |  |  |
| MUL                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| PAC                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| FRL                                       | 60                                     |                           |  |  |

**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                                   | 53       |        |             | 54        |         |              | 49       |         |           |                   |                     | 58           |
| SWD  | 19       |        |             | 28        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 4                   | 62           |
| ELL  | 50       |        |             | 52        |         |              | 45       |         |           |                   | 5                   | 58           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 17       |        |             | 42        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| HSP  | 55       |        |             | 55        |         |              | 51       |         |           |                   | 5                   | 58           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 53       |        |             | 52        |         |              | 50       |         |           |                   | 5                   | 51           |

| 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                                   | 59       | 68     | 49          | 59        | 80      | 73           | 37       |         |           |                   |                     | 55           |
| SWD  | 13       | 41     | 38          | 24        | 76      | 70           | 10       |         |           |                   |                     | 33           |
| ELL  | 61       | 69     | 42          | 60        | 82      | 71           | 27       |         |           |                   |                     | 55           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 60       | 67     | 46          | 59        | 80      | 72           | 37       |         |           |                   |                     | 55           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 59       | 68     | 50          | 59        | 81      | 74           | 35       |         |           |                   |                     | 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                                   | 52       | 58     | 50          | 42        | 39      | 57           |          |         |           |                   |                     | 54           |
| SWD  | 11       | 20     |             | 25        | 50      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     | 39           |
| ELL  | 52       | 60     | 53          | 43        | 41      | 65           |          |         |           |                   |                     | 54           |

| 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 |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 53       | 59     | 55          | 44        | 40      | 58           |          |         |           |                   |                     | 54           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 52       | 58     | 50          | 42        | 39      | 60           |          |         |           |                   |                     | 51           |

### Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA   |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 38%    | 56%      | -18%                       | 54%   | -16%                    |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 43%    | 58%      | -15%                       | 58%   | -15%                    |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 32%    | 52%      | -20%                       | 50%   | -18%                    |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 33%    | 63%      | -30%                       | 59%   | -26%                    |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 57%    | 64%      | -7%                        | 61%   | -4%                     |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 41%    | 58%      | -17%                       | 55%   | -14%                    |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 33%    | 50%      | -17%                       | 51%   | -18%                    |

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

The data component that showed the lowest performance was 3rd grade Reading with 60% of the students scoring below a level 3. Some of the contributing factors to the low performance last year were overall loss of learning, influx of enrollment and student attendance.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year was both 4th and 5th grade with a decline of 6 percentage points. Some of the contributing factors could be that students that were sent home during the pandemic and had a portion of their foundational years being instructed online. Additionally, when schools reopened, more than half of them continued to receiving instruction on line.

**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.**

There were no data components that had a negative gap when comparing with the state average.

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

There were no significant improvements that were made in any area.

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

When reflecting on the EWS data from part 1, our top potential areas of concern are: 1. Poor attendance specifically with the lowest performing students which data reflects the correlation. 2. There are 76 students currently sitting in 3rd grade that have a substantial reading deficiency which need immediate intervention and support.

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

1. Curriculum Enhancement: Regularly review and assure that the curriculum is being delivered as it was aligned with current educational standards and best practices. Review innovative teaching methods and technologies to engage students and enhance their learning experience. Monitor that teachers are sticking to the prescribed curriculum and not pulling in resources that are not approved to be instructed.
2. Professional Development: Invest in the professional growth of teachers and staff through workshops, training sessions, and conferences. This helps them stay updated with the latest teaching techniques and educational trends.
3. Data-Driven Decision Making: Collect and analyze student performance data to identify areas of improvement. Use this data to create targeted interventions and personalized learning plans to address individual student needs.



4. Parent and Community Engagement: Foster strong relationships with parents and the local community. Regularly communicate with parents about their child's progress, involve them in school activities, and seek their input on school initiatives.

5. Student Support Services: Review that comprehensive student support services, including counseling, special education, and behavioral interventions. Ensure that students' physical, emotional, and academic needs are being met effectively.

**Area of Focus**

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

**#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Due to nine new teachers in our school building, it is our goal during the 2023 - 2024 school year to ensure our faculty and staff have a clear sense of direction, shared school vision and shared accountability of student success. Contributing factors could have been change of grade levels or an increase of students in classrooms. We will implement the Targeted Element of Team Building Activities.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

With the at-a-glance team building calendar for the 2023-2024 school year, we would like to see 100% of our new teachers and transfers remain here with us at Hialeah Elementary School for this entire school year and more to come.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored by weekly coaching support and biweekly grade level meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Rosa Iglesias (pr2361@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.)

Team Building - the leadership team will ensure ongoing team activities are implemented and that we plan and execute social activities for all school staff.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for team building as an evidence based intervention is to boost morale, improve interactions and overall establish a culture of collaboration.

**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.

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 The leadership team will create a year-long plan of team building activities. As a result, all staff will be able to participate having planned ahead.

**Person Responsible:** Rosa Iglesias (pr2361@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 Grade level chairs will share feedback with the administrative team regarding activities held in August and September. As a result, feedback will help us plan activities that staff would like to see incorporated.

**Person Responsible:** Rosa Iglesias (pr2361@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 Grade level chairs will share pictures with all faculty and staff and begin the school year team building activity collage for the 2023-2024 school year. As a result, a staff collage will be created and share with everyone monthly.

**Person Responsible:** Rosa Iglesias (pr2361@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

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

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

During the 2022-2023 school year, 28% of our 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students with disabilities scored proficient on the FAST Reading PM3. Based on the data, it is crucial for us to remediate instruction for our students with disabilities to ensure their individual learning needs are being met. Contributing factors have been student attendance and loss of learning. We will implement the Targeted Element of Scaffolding.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The implementation of scaffolding will support teacher instruction and support our students with disabilities to increase their proficiency by 13 percentage points. By June 2024, 41% of our SWD in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade will reflect proficiency in the FAST Reading PM3.

**Monitoring:**

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

Teachers will work with the Reading Coach during planning sessions for explicit examples and learning goals. We will ensure lessons being implemented are aligned with standards based curriculum and that appropriate strategies are in place to support scaffolding instruction.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Rosa Iglesias (pr2361@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this area of focus will be scaffolding. Scaffolding will assist by breaking up new concepts into smaller chunks. Scaffolding helps students build on prior knowledge and internalize new information.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Scaffolding is a method that enables a student to solve problems, reduces frustration and overall simplifies the tasks to make it more manageable and achievable for the student.

**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.

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 Provide teachers support during common planning and in-class coaching support to ensure scaffolded lessons are executed. As a result, teachers will provide explicit scaffolded lessons in their classrooms daily.

**Person Responsible:** Rosa Iglesias (pr2361@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 Teachers will meet with interventionists and review data to monitor student achievement in standards being addressed. As a result, new student groups will be created as needed depending on the results gathered.

**Person Responsible:** Natalie Wagner (nwagner@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 Teachers will review individual student goals on the IEP and ensure goals are measurable based on present data for each student. As a result, goals set will be challenging yet attainable.

**Person Responsible:** Rosa Iglesias (pr2361@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation****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.

In the 2023 FAST ELA, 38% of the students in in grades 3-5 showed proficiency which demonstrates a significant decrease from the previous year which was 60%. Overall it was a decrease in proficiency of 22 percentage points. Contributing factors have been loss of learning and student attendance. We will implement the Targeted Element of Differentiated Instruction.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The implementation of data driven differentiation will ensure that all of our students in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade will be participating in differentiating instruction in their classrooms. Teachers will have D.I. groups posted and students will know their roles in their D.I. rotations. Teachers will plan for D.I. groups with the support of the instructional coaches and have evidence of D.I. in their plans and visible in the classroom through walkthroughs.

**Monitoring:**

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

Administration will schedule and conduct walkthroughs during the designated times that teachers plan for differentiated instruction in their classrooms.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Rosa Iglesias (pr2361@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.)

Differentiated Instruction - this is a framework for effective teaching that involves students with different avenues to learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for differentiated instruction is because research demonstrates this method benefits a wide range 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.

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 The administrative team will provide previous year data and current data for teachers. As a result, teachers will be able to strategically group students for differentiated instruction (D.I.).

**Person Responsible:** Rosa Iglesias (pr2361@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 Teachers will work alongside the Reading Coach to explicitly plan for Differentiated Instruction during common planning. As a result, D.I. plans will be implemented during the Reading Language Arts block (the last 45 to 30 minutes)

**Person Responsible:** Natalie Wagner (nwagner@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 The administration will conduct walkthroughs to monitor differentiated instruction during the Reading /Language Arts framework and ensure D.I. groups are being implemented daily. As a result, students will be engaged in appropriate D.I. activities.

**Person Responsible:** Rosa Iglesias (pr2361@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

**#4. 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.

The instructional practice specifically relating to intervention is crucial due to the percentage of students in 3rd, 4th and 5th that scored below a level 3. Overall in 3rd through 5th grades, we have a total of 56% of students that are not proficient in Reading. Contributing factors have been need of interventionists to target all students needing intervention. We will implement the Targeted Element of Intervention.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

We aim that our number of students scoring a level 1 or 2 decrease from 56% to 46%. The implementation of interventions will support these students to support in closing the gap with their reading deficiency.

**Monitoring:**

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

The Reading Coach will work with teachers in ensuring the intervention program is implemented with fidelity and that groups are adjusted as needed after state FAST assessments, iReady progress monitoring and more.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Natalie Wagner (nwagner@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this area of focus will be intervention and data-driven decision making.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The implementation of interventions and data-driven decision making will contribute to the overall school improvement by remediating instruction and providing students additional tiered instruction based on the foundations they need.

**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.

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 Assistant Principal and Reading Coach will review the recommended student list for interventions and use additional data from PM1 and iReady AP1 to ensure the students that need intervention are grouped and receiving the intervention they need. As a result, rosters of Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention will be created.

**Person Responsible:** Natalie Wagner (nwagner@dadeschools.net)



**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 The administration will meet with the interventionist and provide a schedule for Tier 2 and Tier 3 Reading interventions. As a result, the interventionist will begin intervention.

**Person Responsible:** Rosa Iglesias (pr2361@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 The Reading Coach will meet and plan with the interventionists to ensure resources, materials and student lists needed are available in order to effectively deliver intervention lessons. As a result, resources needed will support the interventionist in the delivery and overall intervention framework.

**Person Responsible:** Natalie Wagner (nwagner@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

### **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).

The funding allocations are reviewed during ESSAC meetings and some have been used for incentives and writing books for intermediate students. Additionally resources have been used for hiring interventionists to provide tiered intervention to all our targeted students.

### **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**

Instructional practices that will be focused on with our Kinder, 1st and 2nd grade students will be standards-based collaborative planning. According to the 2023 STAR Renaissance assessments, 60% of our students in Kindergarten, 1st and 2nd grade scored below the 40th percentile. We strive to provide daily explicit instruction and ensure that lessons are planned for during collaborative planning and ensure that anchor charts be used to support student learning.

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

Instructional practices that will be focused on with our 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students will be standards-based collaborative planning. Data from the 2023 FAST assessments show that 56 percent of our students in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade are not proficient.

#### **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**

With the implementation of Standards-based Collaborative Planning, our Kindergarten - 2nd Grade students scoring proficient will increase by 10 percentage points (for a total of 50%) in the 2024 FAST STAR Reading PM3 by June 2024.

#### **Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

With the implementation of Standards-based Collaborative Planning, our 3rd - 5th Grade students scoring proficient will increase by 11 percentage points (for a total of 55%) in the 2024 FAST ELA PM3 by June 2024.

#### **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.

The Leadership Team will participate in standards-based collaborative planning will be monitored during planning sessions and conduct walkthroughs to ensure lessons planned for are in fact being delivered with the appropriate instructional strategies. Additional walkthroughs will be completed to focus on students and teacher interaction, student work and overall explicit teaching.

##### **Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Almeida-Fernandez, Madelyn, malmeida@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?

Standards-Based Collaborative Planning refers to any period of time that is scheduled during the school day for multiple teachers, or teams of teachers, to work together. Its primary purpose is to bring teachers together to learn from one another and collaborate on projects that will lead to improvements in standards-aligned lesson quality, instructional effectiveness, and student achievement. Standards-Based lessons should include detailed objectives, activities and assessments that evaluate students on the aligned standards-based content. Collaborative Planning improves collaboration among teachers and promotes learning, insights, and constructive feedback that occur during professional discussions among teachers. Standards-Based lessons, units, materials, and resources are improved when teachers work on them collaboratively.

**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?

The selection of the evidence-based strategy of collaborative planning, specifically Standards-Based Collaborative Planning, is justified by its potential to enhance teaching quality and student achievement. By facilitating joint efforts among teachers during scheduled collaborative planning, this approach ensures the development of lessons aligned with standards, leading to improved instructional effectiveness and better student outcomes. Collaborative planning fosters professional growth through knowledge exchange, resource sharing, and the cultivation of a collaborative culture, all of which collectively contribute to a more impactful and enriching learning environment.

**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                       |
|--|---|
| 8/14/23 - 9/29/23 Establish Data Analysis Protocols: The literacy leadership team will develop protocols for analyzing assessment data, including the FAST Star Reading results for grades K-2nd. Regular meetings will be held to collaboratively review data, spot trends, and pinpoint areas of concern. As a result, the team will set targeted goals for each grade based on students' needs. Collaborative planning sessions will be utilized to adjust strategies based on instructional needs.                             | Almeida-Fernandez, Madelyn,<br>malmeida@dadeschools.net |
| 8/14/23 - 9/29/23 Leadership Support for Collaborative Planning: The literacy leadership team will ensure grade levels participate in collaborative planning sessions. They will ensure that designated time is allocated within the school day for teachers to engage in Standards-Based Collaborative Planning. As a result, the leadership team will increase collaboration, provide resources, and foster a conducive environment for productive planning sessions.  | Wagner, Natalie,<br>nwagner@dadeschools.net             |
| 8/14/23 - 9/29/23 Conduct initial collaborative meeting led by literacy leaders. During this first session, teachers and leadership team will review assessment data, sharing insights and observations collaboratively. As a result, the collaborative data review will enable teachers to identify patterns, collectively brainstorm solutions, and collaboratively adapt strategies to better address the needs of students scoring below the 40th percentile.  | Almeida-Fernandez, Madelyn,<br>malmeida@dadeschools.net |
| Coaching for Differentiated Instruction: Instructional coach will collaborate with teachers to enhance their skills in differentiated instruction through collaborative planning. Coach will provide personalized support to teachers, assisting them in adapting teaching methods collaboratively to meet the diverse learning needs. As a result, this will involve modeling strategies, offering resources, and providing feedback on joint implementation to decrease the number of students below the 40th percentile in ELA. | Wagner, Natalie,<br>nwagner@dadeschools.net             |
| Benchmark Driven Instruction Strategies: Instructional coach will guide teachers in implementing benchmark driven instruction. The coach will facilitate collaborative planning sessions to demonstrate how to analyze assessment data to adjust instruction, ensuring timely interventions for struggling students. As a result, workshops and coaching sessions will focus on building capacity in this area.  | Wagner, Natalie,<br>nwagner@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 School Improvement Plan (SIP) can be disseminated to stakeholders through various channels. These include sharing documents on the school's website, sending newsletters and emails to parents in clear language, conducting parent meetings with translated materials and interpretation services, engaging staff through meetings and updates, collaborating with local businesses and organizations, and utilizing multiple communication channels. This comprehensive approach ensures widespread understanding and involvement while providing accessible information to all stakeholders.

**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 implements a multifaceted approach to build positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders. This includes regular parent-teacher meetings, open communication channels, online portals for tracking student progress, engaging local businesses and organizations, involving parents in decision-making, offering parent education workshops, and providing relevant information including on the school website. These efforts support the school's mission, address student needs, and ensure parents are well-informed about their child's progress.

**Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)**

The school has developed a comprehensive plan to strengthen the academic program, increase learning time, and provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. This includes professional development for teachers, extended learning opportunities, and the implementation of an enriched curriculum to improve student learning outcomes and cater to diverse interests and abilities. Part II of the SIP outlines the specific area of focus and corresponding goals, objectives, and strategies to address the unique needs of the school community.

**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