

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Leewood K 8 Center School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

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

Leewood K 8 Center

10343 SW 124TH ST, Miami, FL 33176

<http://leewood.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.

Leewood K-8 Center's mission is to prepare our students to become the leaders of tomorrow. Our philosophy is "If you believe....You can 'A'chieve."

Provide the school's vision statement.

Leewood K-8 Center's vision is to strive to develop responsible, productive citizens by providing an optimal educational environment that is conducive to learning today and in the future.

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
Bovo, Eduardo	Principal	Leads teachers and staff, se goals and ensure that students meet their learning objectives.
Boyd, Deanne	Assistant Principal	Responsible for issues regarding school management, student activities and services, personnel and curriculum instruction.
Saliers, Kristina	Other	Media Specialist manages the media center while also responsible for creating and implementing all content on Social Media Outlets; also EESAC Chairperson.
Margolesky, Denise	Teacher, K-12	Math Liaison and Department Chairperson for Middle School. Facilitates individual teacher meetings to support goals and collaborates with District Mathematics specialists.
Picos, Magda	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for grade level communication and record keeping.
Jewett, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Middle school representative, ELA.
Ferreyra, Paola	Teacher, K-12	Middle school representative, Science.
Vreones, Staci	Teacher, K-12	Reading Liaison, Elementary School. Facilitates individual teacher meetings to support goals and collaborates with District Reading specialists.
Perry, Kerriane	Teacher, PreK	PreK Representative.
Hernandez, Marlene	Teacher, K-12	Middle School Representative, Social Sciences.
Carbot, Charmelle	Teacher, K-12	Elementary representative, Science.
Coscolluela, Beatriz	Teacher, K-12	Elementary representative, ELA.

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 process of involving stakeholders in the School Improvement Plan (SIP) development is crucial for ensuring that the plan reflects the diverse perspectives and needs of the school community. The School Improvement Plan is dictated by the evidenced areas of critical need from the School Climate Survey results and end of year student achievement data. While the Leadership Team analyzes the

mentioned information to target particular areas of focus, it is also the Leadership Team's responsibility to communicate the proposed action plan to all key stakeholders (i.e., teachers, school staff, parents, students and community members). In turn, our stakeholders are involved in each phase of the SIP to accept and/or edit the document as needed via meaningful engagement opportunities to ensure that the SIP reflects the collective vision and priorities of the school community. Once the SIP is adopted, it is implemented according to the established timelines and action steps. Regular monitoring and evaluation should be conducted to assess progress, identify challenges, and make necessary adjustments. It is important to continue engaging stakeholders throughout the implementation process, keeping them informed and involved to ensure fidelity and optimum success in achieving the intended targeted elements.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation by the administration team, the Leadership Team, EESAC, and all named responsible parties for each action plan/step per targeted element. The school will engage in ongoing progress monitoring and activate effective decision making models after each PM assessment window to revise the plan, as needed, to include our school's greatest areas of need for improvement.

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	84%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	43%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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	5	8	0	4	6	6	6	1	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	3	5	0	2	1	14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	1	9	11	8	2	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	4	9	16	3	2	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	2	6	2	9	17	24	5	69

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	1	0	3	3	8	10	5	1	31

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	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	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	9	2	3	4	5	5	7	10	45
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	12
Course failure in ELA	0	2	3	2	1	2	2	3	2	17
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	2	2	4	5	3	19
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	5	16	6	6	3	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	13	9	10	8	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	4	5	4	16	15	12	9	67

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	2	2	6	12	4	9	8	45

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	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	9	2	3	4	5	5	7	10	45
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	12
Course failure in ELA	0	2	3	2	1	2	2	3	2	17
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	2	2	4	5	3	19
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	5	16	6	6	3	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	13	9	10	8	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	4	5	4	16	15	12	9	67

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	2	2	6	12	4	9	8	45

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	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*	77	61	53	76	62	55	72		
ELA Learning Gains				67			66		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			47		
Math Achievement*	70	63	55	72	51	42	66		
Math Learning Gains				70			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			31		
Science Achievement*	65	56	52	61	60	54	61		
Social Studies Achievement*	93	77	68	95	68	59	78		
Middle School Acceleration	74	75	70	83	61	51	40		
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	73	62	55	80	75	70	81		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	538
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	713
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	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	78			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	84			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	60			

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	44			
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	73			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	82			
FRL	68			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	77			70			65	93	74			73
SWD	44			40			18				4	
ELL	65			59			42				4	73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39			45			25				3	
HSP	79			72			67	91	70		7	73
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	88			82			77		87		4	
FRL	60			54			42	83	58		6	

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	76	67	54	72	70	55	61	95	83			80
SWD	36	59	53	24	55	53	31					
ELL	68	73	64	55	67	69	36					80
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53	71	56	34	48	43	55					
HSP	78	66	57	75	72	61	58	97	84			79
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	82	73		83	74		77	100				
FRL	66	67	51	58	73	62	47	86	81			92

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	72	66	47	66	46	31	61	78	40			81
SWD	23	36	31	22	20	17	22	33				
ELL	56	59	50	46	37	33	70					81
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	38	24	28	17	5	12	58				
HSP	74	70	57	68	49	42	64	81	40			79
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	84	69		82	57		76		55			
FRL	57	53	38	48	30	23	47	70	21			100

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	61%	56%	5%	54%	7%
07	2023 - Spring	74%	50%	24%	47%	27%
08	2023 - Spring	80%	51%	29%	47%	33%
04	2023 - Spring	84%	58%	26%	58%	26%
06	2023 - Spring	69%	50%	19%	47%	22%
03	2023 - Spring	84%	52%	32%	50%	34%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	72%	58%	14%	54%	18%
07	2023 - Spring	27%	48%	-21%	48%	-21%
03	2023 - Spring	80%	63%	17%	59%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	64%	18%	61%	21%
08	2023 - Spring	78%	59%	19%	55%	23%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	58%	-12%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	80%	40%	40%	44%	36%
05	2023 - Spring	41%	50%	-9%	51%	-10%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	56%	32%	50%	38%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	68%	25%	66%	27%

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.

2023: According to end of year student achievement data, the component noting the lowest performance was math proficiency as evidenced by a school score of 65%. Contributing factors to the aforementioned low performance could be associated with 7th grade's low percentage of proficient students in Math at 27%.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from the previous year was noted in Civics from 95% in 2022 to 93% in 2023. A possible factor contributing to this decline could be the little to no change in overall reading proficiency levels maintaining at 75% from 2022 to 2023.

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.

State average for mathematics proficiency for 2021-2022 was 53%. Despite our school data showing an average mathematics proficiency of 65% which is higher than the state, it was a decrease from previous school year. The contributing factors to this need for improvement in mathematics are the lack of resources and implementation of support programs for the students in need of additional instructional time. Some new actions that would be taken to address the need for improvement are incentive programs for staff and students to participate in before and after school tutoring and enrichment/remediation programs.

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

The data component showing the most improvement from the previous year was proficiency levels in Algebra 1 noting an increase from 91% in 2022 to 94% in 2023. Implementation of IXL, specifically the program's diagnostic assessments and tailored students' action plans, as well as using the program with fidelity helped improve overall math student achievement in our school.

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

Upon reflecting on the EWS data from Part 1, one potential area of concern includes 5th grade Reading percent proficiency levels.

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

The highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming academic year include: 1) Increasing 5th grade Reading percent proficiency; 2) Increasing students with disabilities percent proficiency on NGSSS Science Assessment; 3) Improving teacher attendance to promote better continuity of quality education; and 4) Improving student discipline protocols and measures to promote a better learning environment for all.

Area of Focus

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

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

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

According to data analysis from 2023 FAST ELA/Reading Assessment results, an increase in reading proficiency for 5th grade is an area of critical need for improvement. Comparison data from 2022 to 2023 showed a decrease in 5th grade level proficiency from 71% to 61%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of student-centered learning, 5th grade students will increase overall proficiency on the final administration (PM3) of FAST ELA/Reading assessment by at least 5%.

Monitoring:

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

Fifth grade teachers (Carbot, Flachner) will hold monthly data chats with their students, analyze i-Ready reports, and monitor student progress using Topic Assessment data on Performance Matters.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deanne Boyd (dmboyd@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 term Student-Centered Learning refers to a wide variety of educational programs, learning experiences, instructional approaches, and academic-support strategies (physical or virtual) that are intended to address the distinct learning needs, interests, aspirations, or cultural backgrounds of individual students and groups of students. At Leewood K-8 Center, this approach incorporates, but is not exclusive to, digital math programs such as Reflex, real world simulations, student centers, and hands-on learning opportunities within interactive classroom environments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By implementing student-centered learning, teachers will be able to provide opportunities for remediation, before and after school, to increase student proficiency in specific target areas.

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 Teachers will utilize reports from Performance Matters assessments to address remediation of 5th grade students not demonstrating reading proficiency.

Person Responsible: Deanne Boyd (dmboyd@dadeschools.net)

By When: Teachers will pull and analyze Performance Matters reports on a monthly basis starting September 2023 and continuing practice through the end of the school year.

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 Upon completion of PM1, fifth grade teachers will present data of students' results on the FAST Reading assessment during their weekly grade level meetings. Analysis of data will guide the fifth grade teachers to identify appropriate future progress monitoring assessments for students based on the instructional needs of 5th grade.

Person Responsible: Deanne Boyd (dmboyd@dadeschools.net)

By When: Presentation of student achievement data in 5th grade Reading and corresponding recommendations for progress monitoring will be delivered by September 22, 2023.

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 Promote i-Ready across all grade levels, by advertising classroom incentives for students attaining weekly goals, with an increased emphasis on 5th grade reading.

Person Responsible: Eduardo Bovo (pr2881@dadeschools.net)

By When: All teachers will monitor and analyze student completion rates of i-Ready lessons and time on task on a weekly basis through September 29, 2023.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2023 NGSSS Science Assessment data, only 40% of fifth grade students demonstrated proficiency thus noting a critical need for improvement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of data-driven decision making by the science teachers, there will be a minimum 5 percentage point increase in Science proficiency for fifth grade from 40% to 45% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Science teachers from kindergarten through fifth grade (i.e., De La Rosa, Flores, Gould, Kelly, Quintero-Rodriguez, Vreones, Wheeler, Beiley, Flachner, and Carbot), will hold monthly data chats with their students and monitor student progress via analysis of Performance Matters reports and formal classroom assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deanne Boyd (dmboyd@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, but is not limited to, goal setting, interventions, teacher placement, course work, and differentiating instruction. This will help achieve our measurable outcome of increasing 5th grade science proficiency by a minimum of 5%.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By implementing the data-driven decision making model, teachers will be able to effectively monitor students' strengths and weaknesses throughout the year. The monitoring of such data will enable teachers to make better informed decisions regarding long-range planning and creating appropriate differentiated instructional plans for their 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 Provide support and resources to teachers to facilitate the use of interactive notebooks in the science classroom.

Person Responsible: Eduardo Bovo (pr2881@dadeschools.net)

By When: Teachers will implement and maintain use of interactive notebooks in the science classroom by 9/29/23.

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 Teachers will implement interactive notebooks with their students starting the first week of September and continue throughout academic year on a weekly basis. Minimum of one entry per week.

Person Responsible: Deanne Boyd (dmboyd@dadeschools.net)

By When: Teachers will review students' interactive notebooks for completion and correctness. Students should have a minimum of 4 entries by 9/29/23.

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 Teachers will collaboratively develop data trackers that can be used to track student performance on topic assessments that are aligned to state standards.

Person Responsible: Deanne Boyd (dmboyd@dadeschools.net)

By When: Teachers will use data trackers to monitor student progress and adjust instruction as necessary by 9/29/23.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

According to staff data populated on Power BI, 34% of faculty were absent more than 10.5 school days. Based on this data, improvement in teacher attendance is a critical need for continuity of a quality education.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With implementation of clear communication with stakeholders, teacher attendance will improve with less than 20% of teachers being absent more than 10.5 school days. This will be evidenced by teacher attendance data on Power BI.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators (Mr. Bovo and Mrs. Boyd) will regularly monitor attendance records and identify any patterns or recurring issues.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eduardo Bovo (pr2881@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.)

With the targeted element of improving teacher attendance, we will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Communication with Stakeholders. By implementing a rewards based attendance initiative and clearly communicating school expectations, we hope to improve teacher attendance throughout the school year to ensure continuity of a quality education.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Communication with Stakeholders is the establishment of well-designed communication protocols that clearly define expectations aligned to school and professional values. When school leaders communicate effectively and transparently, staff and faculty members understand and support the school's mission to promote continuity of teaching and learning as it contributes to high academic achievement.

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 Administration will implement a monthly rewards-based system to recognize teachers for their 100% attendance starting September 2023 through the end of the school year.

Person Responsible: Eduardo Bovo (pr2881@dadeschools.net)

By When: Rewards will be given to teachers on a monthly basis starting September 2023 through the end of the school year.

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 Administration will highlight teachers with consistent attendance records at monthly faculty meetings and/or Good Morning Leewood. As a result, teachers will continue to be motivated to report to work on a consistent basis.

Person Responsible: Eduardo Bovo (pr2881@dadeschools.net)

By When: Teacher recognition will start during the first faculty meeting of September 2023 and end in June 2024.

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 Foster a positive and supportive work environment that encourages teachers to be present and engaged via opportunities for professional development, recognition and collaboration.

Person Responsible: Eduardo Bovo (pr2881@dadeschools.net)

By When: Implementation plan for possible opportunities that create a supportive work environment will be in place from the beginning of the school year and confirmed by 9/29/23.

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the results of the School Climate Survey from 2022-2023, 50% of the teachers do not agree that adequate disciplinary measures are used to address disruptive behaviors.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of a Discipline Advisory Committee, there will be a minimum increase of 5 percentage points on the 2023-2024 School Climate Survey of teachers being satisfied with adequate disciplinary measures to handle disruptive behaviors.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators (Mr. Bovo and Mrs. Boyd) will include discussion of student discipline and implemented consequences during quarterly data chats with all teachers to ensure schoolwide discipline plan is being implemented with fidelity and meeting their individual classroom needs/expectations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deanne Boyd (dmboyd@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 Discipline Advisory Committee will use strategies of Positive Behavior Support (PBS) to address our area of focus. Instead of using a piecemeal approach of individual behavioral management plans, a continuum of PBS for all students in areas including the classroom and non-classroom settings (such as cafeteria, hallways, buses, and restrooms) will be established. PBS interventions will involve creating a behavior plan that includes clear expectations, rewards for positive behavior, and strategies for addressing challenging behavior when it occurs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Positive Behavior Support is an application of a behaviorally-based systems approach to enhance the capacity of schools, families, and communities to design effective environments that improve the link between research-validated practices and the environments in which teaching and learning occurs.

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 Organize and establish a school Discipline Advisory Committee consisting of at least one administrator, primary teacher, intermediate teacher, and secondary teacher.

Person Responsible: Eduardo Bovo (pr2881@dadeschools.net)

By When: The school Discipline Advisory Committee will be established and hold its first meeting no later than 8/18/23.

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 Administrators and teachers will work together to establish clear behavior expectations and rules for the classroom.

Person Responsible: Deanne Boyd (dmboyd@dadeschools.net)

By When: Classroom rules and expectations will be established by August 14, 2023 and clearly communicated to all students by August 25, 2023.

8/14/23 - 9/29/23 Using PBS strategies, the Discipline Advisory Committee will develop a schoolwide behavior management plan for the cafeteria that rewards classes for consistently following cafeteria rules.

Person Responsible: Eduardo Bovo (pr2881@dadeschools.net)

By When: A schoolwide behavior management plan for the cafeteria will be developed and implemented by August 21, 2023.