Kenwood K 8 Center School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Kenwood K 8 Center

9300 SW 79TH AVE, Miami, FL 33156

http://kenwood.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.

Kenwood K-8 Center's mission is to foster each student's academic, social and emotional potential in the pursuit of life long learning and effective citizenship. Growth and excellence in reading, writing, and math competencies are emphasized across the curriculum.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kenwood K-8 Center enriches the community by fostering each student's academic, social, and emotional potential. Students are encouraged to become lifelong learners and effective citizens through developmentally appropriate educational experiences.

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
Rodriguez, Rodolfo	Principal	Provides overall administrative and instructional leadership for all faculty and staff; provides common vision and direction for data-based decision-making, as well as all other aspects of the school's operations. E-mail: pr2701@dadeschools.net Title: Principal
Quintero, Gabriel	Assistant Principal	Assists the Principal with providing common vision and instructional leadership for data-based decision-making; ensures compliance with the implementation of the MTSS model, SEL initiatives, and other district priorities; assesses the effectiveness of processes and programs (e.g., MTSS) and facilitates adjustments, as appropriate. Assigned primary responsibility for monitoring, documenting, and reporting of SIP Implementation and Action Steps, as well as all other aspects of the School Improvement Process. Email: gquintero@dadeschools.net Title: Assistant Principal
Acosta, Sandra	Teacher, K-12	Lead Teacher/School Center for Special Instruction (SCSI) Instructor; facilitates data collection, disaggregation, and review activities including conducting data chats. Functions in an administrative support capacity. Email: sacosta1@dadeschools.net Title: Teacher, K-12
Ortega, Ingrid	Instructional Technology	Coordinates all aspects of technology and device deployment schoolwide; serves as School Assessment Coordinator; advises the Leadership Team on matters related to her areas of responsibility. Email: iortega@dadeschools.net Title: Instructional Technology
Castellanos, Ana	Teacher, ESE	Serves as ESE Chairperson, overseeing and coordinating service provision for SWD. Plans and delivers instruction, services, and supports, to students with disabilities; provides information about core instruction to SWD; serves as liaison to instructional teams. Email: anacastellanos@dadeschools.net Title: Teacher, ESE
Noble, Linda	SAC Member	Plans and delivers instruction to Pre-Kindergarten/Kindergarten students; UTD Steward, EESAC Chairperson Email: lindanoble@dadeschools.net Title: SAC Member
Fonticiella, Barbara	Instructional Media	Coordinates all aspects of instructional media and Media Center operations; supports technology and device deployment schoolwide; supports the administration of school-wide assessments; coordinates and monitors the implementation of tutorial and intervention programs; advises

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		the Leadership Team on matters related to her areas of responsibility. Email: BFonticiella@dadeschools.net Title: Instructional Media

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The School Improvement Process is developed and monitored through a multi-faceted approach. Student performance, School Climate, Professional Development Needs, and other data are collected and analyzed buy the Leadership Team to develop a proposed School Improvement Process plan. The Educational Excellence and School Advisory Committee (EESAC), composed of parents, students, faculty, and community stakeholders, reviews, revises, and approves the School Improvement Process plan. The EESAC is provided a detailed update on progress toward meeting planned goals on a monthly basis during a publicly-noticed meeting. The school's Leadership Team meets to review individual targets on an ongoing basis, and adjust strategies and action steps as needed prior to presenting said adjustments to the EESAC for approval. The Parent/Teacher/Student Organization (PTSO) provides another vehicle for collecting stakeholder input and sharing progress, and stakeholder input is used to make adjustments to Action Steps, as appropriate and subject to approval by the EESAC.

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's Leadership Team convenes and reviews progress on School Improvement Process goals on a quarterly basis. Reviews focus on the analyses of student performance data (e.g., progress monitoring and other assessments) as well as on data pertaining to school culture (e.g., student service provision, attendance). Additional emphasis is placed on monitoring the performances of, and subsequently providing additional supports to, students with special needs, students with two or more early warning indicators, and students receiving supports through the MTSS process. Individuals with primary responsibility for specific action steps monitor progress on a weekly or bi-weekly basis, and share findings with the Leadership Team. Implementation monitoring information is provided to the EESAC on a monthly basis for public input and in order to address any questions or concerns. Revisions to the plan are prepared by the Leadership Team and incorporated into the School Improvement Process plan after presentation, review, and approval by the EESAC at a publicly-noticed meeting.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	93%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	65%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: 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	0	4	13	6	4	6	5	8	11	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	2	3	3	3	3	4	0	3	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	2	8	2	7	4	1	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	17	13	23	23	16	98
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	11	20	25	19	11	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	12	20	27	19	19	28	42	38	206

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	3	7	13	11	18	15	9	79

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	2	3	0	6	0	0	2	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3

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	1	10	12	8	4	7	7	12	12	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	4	6	4	2	4	3	4	1	28
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	3	7	13	14	6	0	49
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	14	18	23	14	29	101
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	18	27	30	22	23	122
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	5	14	20	21	17	21	106

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	4	2	4	0	1	1	0	1	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	7

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	1	10	12	8	4	7	7	12	12	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	4	6	4	2	4	3	4	1	28
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	3	7	13	14	6	0	49
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	14	18	23	14	29	101
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	18	27	30	22	23	122
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	5	14	20	21	17	21	106

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	4	2	4	0	1	1	0	1	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	7

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*	60	61	53	65	62	55	64		
ELA Learning Gains				58			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			51		
Math Achievement*	61	63	55	60	51	42	56		
Math Learning Gains				65			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			33		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	58	56	52	47	60	54	55		
Social Studies Achievement*	87	77	68	81	68	59	81		
Middle School Acceleration	78	75	70	81	61	51	67		
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	67	62	55	61	75	70	55		

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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	473
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	627
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	43			
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	95			
BLK	43			
HSP	67			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	61			

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	39	Yes	2	
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	62			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	59			

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	60			61			58	87	78			67
SWD	30			32			24	71			6	70
ELL	49			52			29	77			6	67
AMI												
ASN	90			100							2	
BLK	54			31							2	
HSP	59			60			56	89	78		7	68
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	65			70			69				3	
FRL	55			53			49	81	73		7	58

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	65	58	51	60	65	58	47	81	81			61
SWD	26	41	37	26	54	56	19	50				38
ELL	51	52	51	46	67	56	43	52	73			61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	57		39	46							
HSP	65	57	49	59	66	57	46	79	80			61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67	69		69	65		53					
FRL	58	54	49	53	63	59	38	76	80			61

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	64	60	51	56	48	33	55	81	67			55
SWD	28	52	45	24	40	37	32	65				29
ELL	51	61	55	41	39	27	35	67	64			55

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	53	55		52	25		25					
HSP	64	62	54	55	49	34	57	81	66			54
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	68	41		67	50		53		70			
FRL	58	59	47	48	42	33	42	77	53			56

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. <u>The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments</u>.

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	61%	56%	5%	54%	7%
07	2023 - Spring	60%	50%	10%	47%	13%
08	2023 - Spring	56%	51%	5%	47%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	58%	4%	58%	4%
06	2023 - Spring	46%	50%	-4%	47%	-1%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	52%	4%	50%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	49%	58%	-9%	54%	-5%
07	2023 - Spring	59%	48%	11%	48%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	62%	63%	-1%	59%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	64%	-11%	61%	-8%
08	2023 - Spring	65%	59%	6%	55%	10%
05	2023 - Spring	49%	58%	-9%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	60%	40%	20%	44%	16%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	50%	0%	51%	-1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	56%	35%	50%	41%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	68%	17%	66%	19%

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.

Although Eighth grade Math proficiency reflected a 48% mastery rate (46 students), these numbers do not consider Eighth grade students who enrolled in and passed Algebra (86 students). Forty-nine percent of Sixth grade students demonstrated proficiency on the F.A.S.T. ELA. Apart from the need for additional instructional interventions, differentiated instruction, and supports, this cohort also demonstrated a significant number of behavioral issues that likely impacted instruction.

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

Sixth grade students' ELA proficiency decreased by 13 percentage-points, from 62% on the 2022 FSA ELA to 49% on the 2023 F.A.S.T. PM3 Reading. Approximately 60 students in this cohort have been recommended for Intensive Reading during Seventh grade. Apart from the need for additional instructional interventions, differentiated instruction, and supports, this cohort also demonstrated a significant number of behavioral issues that likely impacted instruction.

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.

Sixth grade students' Math proficiency (49%) was 10 percentage-points lower than the District mean (59%), and 6 percentage-points lower than the State mean (55%). Additionally, Sixth grade student cohort's ELA proficiency is also below District and State mean performances. Fourth grade Math proficiency (52%) was 9 percentage-points below the State mean (61%), and 12 percentage-points

below the District mean (64%). Fifth grade Math proficiency (50%) was 5 percentage-points below the State mean (55%), and 7 percentage-points below the District mean (57%).

Reduced departmentalization in Fourth grade may have contributed to the decreases in Math proficiency. In spite of the availability of an hourly Math Interventionist in supporting selected Fourth and Fifth grade students, more robust supports, remediation, and instructional differentiation are needed in Fourth through Sixth grade Math.

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

The percentage of Eighth grade students demonstrating mastery in Science increased from 44% in 2021-2022 to 60% in 2022-2023 (a 16 percentage-point increase). The implementation of best practices and strategies gained through visits to schools with model Science programs, combined with an increased focus on Science data chats, and subsequent data-driven instructional planning and instructional delivery, contributed directly to the improvement. The percentage of students demonstrating mastery in Algebra (91%) was 26 and 29 percentage-points higher than the District and State means, respectively.

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

Increase the provision of MTSS supports, interventions, and differentiated instruction in ELA and Math in order to increase the percentage of Third through Seventh grade students demonstrating mastery in these areas.

Addressing behavioral issues among students in Sixth and Seventh grades, and enhancing the provision of MTSS Behavioral and SEL interventions and supports to mitigate impacts of behaviors.

Expanding attendance monitoring and intervention efforts to further reduce the number of students with 10 or more unexcused absences.

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

Improving Science mastery in grade 5;

Improving Math proficiency in grades Four through Six;

Increasing MTSS Behavioral and SEL interventions and supports to mitigate impacts of behaviors;

Improving ELA proficiency in grade 7; and

Improving ELA proficiency in grade 4.

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 Science

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

While Fifth grade Science scores reflected a 4 percentage-point increase (50%) as compared to 2022 performances (46%), a six-year trend of decreasing Science scores since 2017 (59%) continues. This trend was exacerbated by learning losses caused by COVID-19 impacts. Additionally, School Climate Survey – Teacher data indicate that 48% of respondents felt students are lacking in foundational knowledge attributable to a variety of factors including learning losses. The sporadic use of formative Science assessments, the need for increased instructional support and collegial conversations to facilitate instructional improvements, and the continuing need to increase hands-on/experiential instruction, also contributed to this area of concern.

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

As a result of the implementation of Instructional Coaching and Supports, the percentage of Fifth grade students demonstrating Mastery in Science will increase by 5 percentage-points to 55%, as measured by the Statewide Science Assessment, by June, 2024.

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

The fidelity of implementation will be reviewed and assessed by the Leadership Team (facilitated by Dr. Sandra Acosta, Lead Teacher, and Dr. Gabriel Quintero, Assistant Principal) on a bi-weekly basis, during which formative student data and classroom walkthrough feedback will be discussed. Additionally, instructional coaches/support providers will meet on a monthly basis with the Leadership Team to share general observations and specific recommendations for further action. Results of Topic and mini-assessments will be reviewed and discussed through grade-level/department and individual data chats, and findings used to inform instructional adjustments. Quarterly reviews of student performance data in Science will be reviewed by the Leadership Team, and findings will be shared with selected faculty and staff, as well as with the EESAC, to support additional opportunities for instructional improvements.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gabriel Quintero (gquintero@dadeschools.net)

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

Our school will use the strategy of Instructional Support/Coaching. Teachers will work together to set a measurable goal to improve instructional outcomes. Coaching Cycles focus on the identified goal and increases the achievement and engagement of every student by bringing out the best performance of every teacher. Coaches use both student-centered and teacher-centered methods to help teachers improve the decisions they make about their instruction.

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

As a result of personnel changes, new faculty members will be assuming primary responsibility for the teaching of Fifth grade Science and Eighth grade Science. In light of this opportunity, instructional coaching and increased student-centered, data-driven supports will be identified and implemented. The Coaching Cycle and similar dialogical mechanisms provide a framework within which student and teacher-centered goals can be established and monitored in a manner that ensures accountability and encourages individual ownership of the improvement efforts. Additionally, the incorporation of frequent, robust data

chats and reflective conversations regarding the implications of performance data on instructional planning and delivery will contribute directly to performance improvements, as well as provide opportunities to engage in vertical articulation and planning in Science across elementary grades.

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.

Review area of focus, evidence-based strategies, and the nature and role of instructional coaching with all faculty and staff during opening of school meetings from 8/14/2023 through 9/29/2023.

Person Responsible: Gabriel Quintero (gquintero@dadeschools.net)

By When: This Action Step will be implemented from 8/14/2023 through 9/29/2023, and subject to adjustments based on reviews of progress, as appropriate.

Following the administration of the Fifth Grade Science Benchmark Assessment, student performance data will be collected and analyzed in order to inform initial student and teacher-centered goal identification in support of the provision of instructional coaching to Science teachers from 8/14/2023 through 9/29/2023.

Person Responsible: Sandra Acosta (sacosta1@dadeschools.net)

By When: This Action Step will be implemented from 8/14/2023 through 9/29/2023, and subject to adjustments based on reviews of formative data, as appropriate.

The Leadership Team will review the implementation and delivery of instructional coaching, supports, and any additional strategies, based on feedback from student performances, teacher input, data chats, and classroom walkthroughs, on a biweekly basis from 8/14/2023 through 9/29/2023.

Person Responsible: Gabriel Quintero (gquintero@dadeschools.net)

By When: This Action Step will be implemented from 8/14/2023 through 9/29/2023, and subject to adjustments based on reviews of formative data, as appropriate.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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 Math proficiency of students in Fourth through Sixth grades was below both the District and State mean proficiency levels. In 2022-2023, Sixth grade students' Math proficiency (49%) was 10 percentage-points lower than the District mean (59%), and 6 percentage-points lower than the State mean (55%). Fifth grade Math proficiency (50%) was 5 percentage-points below the State mean (55%), and 7 percentage-points below the District mean (57%). Fourth grade Math proficiency (52%) was 9 percentage-points below the State mean (61%), and 12 percentage-points below the District mean (64%).

Reduced departmentalization in Fourth grade may have contributed to the decreases in Math proficiency. In spite of the availability of an hourly Math Interventionist supporting selected Fourth and Fifth grade students, more robust supports, remediation, and instructional differentiation are needed in Fourth through Sixth grade Math. School Climate Survey – Teacher data indicate that 48% of respondents felt students are lacking in foundational knowledge attributable to a variety of factors including learning loses due to COVID-19, particularly in Fifth grade. The inconsistent use of formative assessments, the need for increased articulation and collegial conversations to facilitate instructional improvements, and the continuing need to increase the provision of Math interventions, have also contributed to this area of concern.

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

As a result of the implementation of Collaborative Data Chats and Differentiated Instruction, the percentage of Fifth grade students demonstrating Proficiency in Math will increase by 5 percentage-points to 55%, as measured by the F.A.S.T. Math Assessment, by June, 2024.

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

The fidelity of implementation will be reviewed and assessed by the Leadership Team (facilitated by Dr. Sandra Acosta, Lead Teacher, and Dr. Gabriel Quintero, Assistant Principal) on a bi-weekly basis, during which formative student data and classroom walkthrough feedback will be discussed. Additionally, results from topic and mini-assessments will be reviewed and discussed through grade-level/department and individual data chats, and findings used to inform instructional adjustments. Quarterly reviews of student performance data in Math will be reviewed by the Leadership Team, and findings will be shared with selected faculty and staff, as well as with the EESAC, to support additional opportunities for instructional improvements.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gabriel Quintero (gquintero@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.)

Primarily, Collaborative Data Chats will be scheduled and facilitated by Dr. Sandra Acosta, Lead Teacher. During Collaborative Data Chats, teachers, support staff, and administration analyze student performance data and determine how that information will be used to drive future instruction (incorporation of virtual platforms can be utilized to encourage collaborative data chats).Time is also allotted to discuss activities and strategies teachers have used to remediate and/or enrich students on the assessed standards. Students who are in MTSS or who are identified as fragile are also discussed, with support provided by Dr. Quintero (Assistant Principal), and Ms. Marquez and Ms. Varas (Counselors). This ensures they are

receiving the proper support. Data chats are also a time to discuss teacher needs as it relates to additional assistance needed in the classroom, and in what ways both administration and support staff can assist teachers with those needs.

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

Collaborative data chats provide a mechanism through which the Leadership Team and teachers can engage in deep reviews of student performance data, particularly formative and progress monitoring data, that will inform adjustments to instructional planning and delivery. Additionally, these conversations also provide opportunities to initiate and engage in meaningful dialogue focused on vertical articulation in order to build capacity and sustain improvements in Math. In order to ensure the needs of all students are addressed, specifically the needs of Students with Disabilities (SWD), increased emphasis on the provision of differentiated instruction, informed by collaborative data chats, will be central to the success of this Area of Focus."

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.

Review area of focus, evidence-based strategies, and the expectations for implementation, with all faculty and staff during opening of school and monthly faculty meetings from 8/14/2023 through 9/29/2023.

Person Responsible: Gabriel Quintero (gquintero@dadeschools.net)

By When: This Action Step will be implemented by 8/15/2023; the implementation will be ongoing thereafter, and subject to adjustments based on reviews of progress, as appropriate.

Selected teachers will be provided with Professional Learning sessions focused on effective pacing, instruction, and assessments in the Elementary and Middle Grades Math classroom from 8/14/2023 through 9/29/2023.

Person Responsible: Gabriel Quintero (gquintero@dadeschools.net)

By When: This Action Step will be implemented from 8/14/2023 through 9/29/2023, and subject to adjustments based on reviews of progress, as appropriate.

The Leadership Team will review the implementation of data chats and instructional differentiation, in light of formative student data, feedback from from collegial conversations, and classroom walkthroughs, on a monthly basis from 8/14/2023 through 9/29/2023.

Person Responsible: Sandra Acosta (sacosta1@dadeschools.net)

By When: This Action Step will be implemented from 8/14/2023 through 9/29/2023, and subject to adjustments based on reviews of progress, as appropriate.

#3. 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.

2022-2023 data reflected that 22% of SWDs demonstrated proficiency on the F.A.S.T. PM 3 in Reading, while 25% demonstrated proficiency on the F.A.S.T. PM3 in Math. In 2022, SWD performed below the ESSA threshold in Reading, with 26% of students demonstrating Mastery in Reading based on results of the FSA. FSA ELA from 2021 reflect that 28% of SWD demonstrated Mastery in Reading.

The performances of SWD were likely negatively impacted as a result of unavoidable structural changes to the SWD program resulting from staff and program changes, as well as the implementation of new standards and assessments. Scheduling changes and enhancements to SWD support mechanisms led to increases in the percentage of SWD making progress toward proficiency, but additional improvements addressing achievement of proficiency.

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

As a result of data-driven instructional planning, delivery, and differentiation, the percentage of SWDs demonstrating proficiency on the 2023-2024 F.A.S.T. PM3 Reading and Math will each increase by 3 percentage points to 25% and 28%, respectively.

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

The fidelity of implementation will be assessed and insured through the implementation of regular classroom walkthroughs conducted by the Leadership Team. A review of PLC/Department meeting minutes will also reflect the implementation of data-driven instructional planning. The effectiveness of strategies will be determined through a review of student performances in Reading and Math as measured by I-Ready and other classroom-based assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gabriel Quintero (gquintero@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.)

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

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

Purposeful data collection and analysis will be critical to effective instructional planning and delivery. Additionally, data-driven planning is more responsive to individual student needs, allowing teachers to focus differentiated instruction more strategically.

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.

Review area of focus, evidence-based strategies, and the nature and role of instructional coaching with all faculty and staff, with an emphasis on meeting the needs of Students with Disabilities, during opening of school and monthly faculty meetings from 8/14/2023 through 9/29/2023.

Person Responsible: Gabriel Quintero (gquintero@dadeschools.net)

By When: This Action Step will be completed by August 25, 2023, as evidenced by Professional Development Day agendas, as well as Faculty and PLC Meeting minutes.

Monthly meeting with Instructional Leaders to review progress on implementation of strategies identified through data chats, particularly in the areas of ELA and Math, with an increased focus on SWDs from 8/18/2023 through 9/29/2023.

Person Responsible: Gabriel Quintero (gquintero@dadeschools.net)

By When: This Action Step will be implemented beginning on August 15, 2023, and implementation will be ongoing thereafter.

Review and revise SWD Instructional Support schedules in order to increase supports provided in ELA, Math, and Science in grades 3-5 and 6-8 from 8/18/2023 through 9/29/2023.

Person Responsible: Ana Castellanos (anacastellanos@dadeschools.net)

By When: SWD Instructional Support schedules will be reviewed on a bi-weekly basis, and input from data chats and classroom walkthroughs will be used to inform adjustments, as appropriate.

#4. 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.

Based on the data review, our school will implement the targeted element of student attendance relating to Early Warning Systems. A review of our schoolwide annual attendance percentage revealed a .25 percentage-point increase, from 94.75% in 2021-2022 to 95% in 2022-2023. However, review of 2022-2023 student attendance data revealed that 57 students had an annual attendance percentage under 90%, as compared to 45 students during the 2021-2022 school year; a 27 percentage-point increase. We recognize the need to target our attendance initiatives more strategically, increase the intensity of attendance interventions, and improve in making robust connections with families to ensure attendance improves and remains consistently high.

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

As a result of increased attention to Early Warning System indicators specifically targeting attendance monitoring and interventions, we expect to decrease the number of students with less than 90% attendance by 15 percentage-points (i.e., 8 students) by May, 2024, as measured by quarterly attendance percentages.

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

Dr. Gabriel Quintero will have primary responsibility for monitoring student attendance on a weekly basis, as well as coordinating Attendance Review Committee and Truancy Child Study Team functions with (Ms. Margarita Marquez, Ms. Ileana Varas (Counselors), Ms. Janet Delgado (Social Worker), and Ms. Ailemsy Hernandez (Attendance Clerk). Monthly attendance reports will be prepared and submitted through the iAttend platform, and reviewed with the Leadership Team. Quarterly reviews of student attendance data, attendance actions, and impact will be conducted on a quarterly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gabriel Quintero (gquintero@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.)

In order to address this Focus Area, Attendance Initiatives will be the primary evidence-based intervention. In order to ensure instructional and social-emotional impacts associated with attendance issues are addressed, robust and proactive responses to Early Warning System indicators will be implemented as well.

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. Response to Early Warning Systems (EWS) involves establishing a system based on student data to identify students who exhibit behavior or academic performance that puts them at risk of dropping out of school. Response to EWS utilizes predictive data, identifies off-track or at-risk students, targets interventions, and reveals patterns and root causes.

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.

2022-2023 attendance data and the 2023-2024 Attendance Action Plan will be shared with faculty and staff during Opening of School Meetings and Faculty Meetings from August 14, 2023 through September 29, 2023.

Person Responsible: Gabriel Quintero (gquintero@dadeschools.net)

By When: Action Step will be ongoing from August 14, 2023 through September 29, 2023.

The Attendance Review Committee will convene to review 2022-2023 attendance data, establish a Committee meeting schedule, and identify strategies to encourage and address improving student attendance from August 14, 2023 through September 29, 2023.

Person Responsible: Gabriel Quintero (gquintero@dadeschools.net)

By When: The Attendance Review Committee will convene at least monthly from August 14, 2023 through September 29, 2023.

A review of attendance actions undertaken will be completed by the Attendance Review Committee at least monthly, with findings shared with the Leadership Team in order to inform revisions to attendance strategies, from August 14, 2023 through September 29, 2023.

Person Responsible: Gabriel Quintero (gquintero@dadeschools.net)

By When: The review of attendance actions will be conducted at least monthly, with the subsequent review by the Leadership Team from August 14, 2023 through September 29, 2023.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The School Improvement Process is developed and monitored through a multi-faceted approach. Student performance, School Climate, Professional Development Needs, and other data are collected and analyzed by the Leadership Team and the Educational Excellence and School Advisory Committee (EESAC), composed of parents, students, faculty, and community stakeholders, reviews, revises, and approves the School Improvement Process plan. Decisions regarding resource allocation, as well as the development of additional interventions and action step adjustments, are a result of data-driven collaboration and reflection between these two entities. The Parent/Teacher/Student Organization (PTSO) provides another vehicle for collecting stakeholder input and sharing progress, and stakeholder input is used to further inform resource allocation and plan adjustments prior to presentation to the EESAC for review and approval.

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: Science	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$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