Miami-Dade County Public Schools

William H. Lehman Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

William H. Lehman Elementary School

10990 SW 113TH PL, Miami, FL 33176

http://williamlehman.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.

William Lehman Elementary strives to create a safe environment where each child can grow intellectually, socially, and emotionally by fostering a community of learners who focus on learning, respect, and individual excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of William Lehman Elementary is to transform lives by instilling 21st Century skills and inspiring lifelong learning in every student.

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
Baldessari, Marybel	Principal	Our principal provides a shared vision for the use of data-based decision-making, promotes our school mission and vision, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS (Multi-Tiered System of Supports), ensures and monitors the safety and well-being of all students, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school based MTSS plans and activities.
Tamargo, Arleen	Assistant Principal	Our assistant principal provides a shared vision for the use of data-based decision-making, promotes our school mission and vision, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS (Multi-Tiered System of Supports), ensures and monitors the safety and well-being of all students, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. She is also the testing chairperson.
Alonso, Francis	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chairperson Provides information about core instruction for math to the team, leads regularly-scheduled team planning sessions, participates in student data collection, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.
Mancini, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Reading Department Chairperson Provides information about core instruction for reading to the team, leads regularly-scheduled team planning sessions, participates in student data collection, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.
Bandrich, Esperanza	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chairperson Provides information about core instruction for science to the team, leads regularly-scheduled team planning sessions, participates in student data collection, attends science liaison meetings, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.
Garcia, Aileen	School Counselor	Mental Health Specialist Our guidance counselor provides individual, small group, and class counseling sessions for students. Character education is emphasized during these sessions on a regular basis. Our counselor and the Student Support Team meet on a regular basis to address students with academic needs and behavioral challenges.

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 leadership team met to analyze data and to discuss the areas of strength and the areas of focus. During a faculty meeting, current data and the needs of the students and the school were discussed. Teachers provided input for the development of this year's SIP. Also, the Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) meets and allows members to provide additional input.

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

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) will be regularly monitored by administration and teacher leaders throughout the 2023-2024 school year via FAST PM1, FAST PM2, student grades, PoweBi reports, iReady, and attendance bulletins. The SIP will be revised as needed in order to prioritize the needs of students with the greatest achievement gap. The SIP and current data will be presented at faculty meetings and to the EESAC throughout the year. At each EESAC meeting, the SIP is reviewed and discussed.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	91%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	68%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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	2	10	3	5	5	4	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	17	13	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	5	6	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	11	22	30	21	15	0	0	0	100

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	0	0	10	8	6	0	0	0	26

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	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) 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	13	3	5	6	4	5	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	29	14	13	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	6	5	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	13	27	19	33	17	19	0	0	0	128

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	2	2	1	18	6	4	0	0	0	33

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	74	60	53	76	62	56	74		
ELA Learning Gains				79			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				66			45		
Math Achievement*	84	66	59	81	58	50	69		
Math Learning Gains				90			62		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				87			52		
Science Achievement*	68	58	54	69	64	59	67		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	73	63	59	57			66		

** 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	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	369
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	605
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	55			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	78			
HSP	71			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	91			

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	70			

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	52			
ELL	72			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	75			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	88			
FRL	71			

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	74			84			68					73
SWD	49			60			60				5	59
ELL	65			78			64				5	73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	64			91							2	
HSP	71			82			65				5	72
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	91			91			90				4	
FRL	68			80			68				5	73

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	79	66	81	90	87	69					57
SWD	43	61	38	60	89		36					38
ELL	70	82	70	73	86	79	58					57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	74	78	66	80	90	85	68					57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	91	88		87	87							
FRL	70	74	61	78	88	81	63					53

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	74	64	45	69	62	52	67					66
SWD	50	40		59	67		41					
ELL	70	65	45	68	55		66					66
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	77			69								
HSP	74	66	50	69	64	56	69					63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	77			69			50					
FRL	69	56	39	63	60	53	58					64

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	75%	56%	19%	54%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	58%	13%	58%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	60%	52%	8%	50%	10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	72%	63%	9%	59%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	64%	18%	61%	21%
05	2023 - Spring	82%	58%	24%	55%	27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	64%	50%	14%	51%	13%

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.

Grade 3 ELA showed the lowest performance (60% proficiency). Historically, grade 3 ELA scores have been the lowest when analyzing William Lehman's data trend. Students working below grade level can be attributed to lack of attendance, foundational skills, and implementation of Computer-Based Testing as well as an influx of new students.

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

Grade 3 ELA showed the greatest decline (68% to 60% proficiency). Historically, grade 3 ELA scores have been the lowest when analyzing William Lehman's data trend. Students working below grade level can be attributed to lack of attendance, foundational skills, and implementation of Computer-Based Testing as well as an influx of new students.

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.

Grade 3 ELA showed the greatest gap with 60% proficiency compared to the state's 50% proficiency. Historically, grade 3 ELA scores have been the lowest when analyzing William Lehman's data trend. Students working below grade level can be attributed to lack of attendance, foundational skills, and implementation of Computer-Based Testing as well as an influx of new students.

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

Grade 4 ELA Mathematics showed the most improvement (79% proficiency to 82% proficiency). The new actions William Lehman implemented were STEAM curriculum, "CHESS to Think" program, and the restructuring of the grade level.

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

Student attendance is a potential area of concern since there was an increase in the percentage of students with 6 or more absences (26% to 30%). Some interventions that will be implemented for this area of concern are incentives (perfect attendance certificates, 100% monthly attendance celebrations, and special treats/rewards for attendance improvement) and action intervention (parent contact at 3 absences, letters sent home, and referral to the counselor.

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

School improvement priorities for the upcoming school year are the implementation of a variety of strategies to increase ELA achievement in grade 3 (intervention, differentiated instruction, after school tutoring, before school tutoring), professional development offerings for teachers, and student attendance (incentives, activities, recognition, meetings).

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 Differentiation

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

According to the 2023 FAST PM3 data, 60% of our 3rd grade students were on or above grade level when compared to 68% in 2022. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of lack of foundational skills, implementation of computer-based testing, and influx of new students, we will implement the Targeted Element of Differentiation.

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

With the implementation of Differentiated Instruction utilizing Data-Driven Instruction, a minimum of 62% of the third grade students will achieve a level 3 or above as evidenced by the 2024 FAST PM3.

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

Teachers will use Data-Driven Instruction to design lesson plans to meet the students' individual needs and learning styles. By analyzing data from student performance and formative assessments, teachers will target standards that need to be remediated to ensure students are demonstrating growth. During Differentiated Instruction, teachers will target standards for each student's individual needs. Administrators will conduct quarterly data chats with teachers to discuss data and ways to help meet each student's needs. Administrators will also conduct walkthroughs to ensure quality instruction is taking place. Extended learning opportunities will be provided to students who are not showing growth through Tier 2/ Tier 3 intervention and/or before/after school tutoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marybel Baldessari (pr2891@dadeschools.net)

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

Differentiated Instruction will be implemented to address individual students' needs. By effectively implementing lessons on based on data-driven instruction for individual needs, student performance will increase due to the different avenues of instruction.

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

Differentiated Instruction will contribute to the overall school improvement since each student's needs will be addressed and met. This intervention was chosen since each student has their own needs and learning style. By using differentiated instruction, the expected outcome is that teachers will be able to remedy and focus on students' individual needs.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

The creation and implementation of an intervention schedule will be used to target our L25. As a result, L25 students will be receiving targeted instruction.

Person Responsible: Arleen Tamargo (tamargoa@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14, 2023

A professional development for data interpretation will be offered to teachers to enhance the approach of instruction utilizing assessments, analysis, and actions to meet their students' needs. As a result, teachers will have a better understanding of interpreting data to target students' needs.

Person Responsible: Marybel Baldessari (pr2891@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 25, 2023

Administration will secure personnel to create extended learning opportunities for students. This will allow for activities designed to provide learning opportunities for students beyond the school day as well as enrichment opportunities for students. As a result, teachers will provide students with extended learning opportunities that target areas of concern.

Person Responsible: Marybel Baldessari (pr2891@dadeschools.net)

By When: 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 2022-2023 FCAT Science data, there was a decrease from 2022 to 2023 of 5 percentage points from 69% on the 2022 FCAT Science to 64% on the 2023 FCAT Science. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of a gap due to lack of focus on Science in lower grades, influx of students new to William Lehman in fifth grade, and gaps in education due to pandemic, we will implement the targeted element of an interactive learning environment.

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

With the implementation of an interactive learning environment, a minimum of 66% of the fifth grade students will achieve a level 3 or above on the Science FACT as evidenced by the 2024 Science FCAT.

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

Teachers will use data to design bi-weekly labs and interactive lessons to provide students with hands on activities. Teachers will implement the STEAM Matrix in order to target standards and ensure students have a thorough understanding and academic growth. Administrators will provide opportunities for vertical planning and instructional coaching. Monthly data chats to discuss topic tests, Science test scores, baseline, mid-year and end-of-year Science assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marybel Baldessari (pr2891@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.)

Interactive Learning Environment will be implemented to allow students the opportunity to interact with visual aids/scaffolds that support the acquisition or assimilation of prerequisite skills, academic vocabulary, and instructional/metacognitive processes.

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

Interactive Learning Environments will contribute to the overall school improvement since students will be provided with interactive science activities to enhance their understanding of scientific concepts. This intervention was chosen since it provides students with an interactive approach to learning. By using Interactive Learning Environments, the expected outcome is that each student will increase their understanding of scientific concepts.

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.

Create and implement a bi-weekly Science Lab schedule for all students. As a result, students will have access to a hands-on science inquiry lab.

Person Responsible: Esperanza Bandrich (ebandrich@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 1, 2023

Schedule Vertical Planning Meetings for teachers. As a result, teachers will deliver smooth, organized science curriculum that prepares students for the next grade level.

Person Responsible: Marybel Baldessari (pr2891@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14, 2023

Implement STEAM Matrix. As a result, students will be engaged and prepared in Science, Technology, Engineering, Art and Mathematics.

Person Responsible: Esperanza Bandrich (ebandrich@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 15, 2023

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

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

According to 2023 Early Warning Systems data, there was an increase in students with 6-10 absences when compared to 2022 from 26% of students in 2022 and 30% of students in 2023, an increase of 4 percentage points. Based on the data and the contributing factors of cultural misconceptions about the importance of school attendance, scheduling of appointments during school time, and transportation issues, we will implement attendance initiatives.

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

With the implementation of attendance initiatives, our attendance will improve by a minimum of 2 percentage points as evidenced by the 2024 Early Warning Systems.

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

School-wide attendance policy will be reviewed with students and parents in the beginning of the school year. Teachers will monitor daily attendance reports for student absences and make contact with parents of students with three consecutive absences. Teachers will review attendance bulletin for errors in need of correction. Administration will monitor student with five or more absences and make parent contact via letter. Referrals will be made to counselor for students needing help with transportation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Arleen Tamargo (tamargoa@dadeschools.net)

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

Strategic Attendance Initiatives will be implemented to address student attendance. By effectively implementing attendance initiatives, student attendance will improve.

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

Strategic Attendance Initiatives will contribute to the overall school improvement since students will be present at school to learn curriculum. This intervention was chosen since student attendance is imperative for successful student progress in school. By using strategic attendance initiatives, the expected outcome is that student attendance will increase and absences will decrease.

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.

A School-wide Attendance Plan will be implemented. As a result, all staff will be involved to ensure students and parents understand the importance of attendance.

Person Responsible: Marybel Baldessari (pr2891@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 31, 2023

Administration and teachers will monitor the daily attendance bulletin. As a result, student attendance is closely monitored by administration and teachers.

Person Responsible: Arleen Tamargo (tamargoa@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17, 2023

The M-DCPS Monthly Attendance Action Plan will be implemented. As a result, student attendance is closely monitored by administration and teachers.

Person Responsible: Arleen Tamargo (tamargoa@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 22, 2023

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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

According to the 2023 FAST PM3 data, 60% of our 3rd grade students were on or above grade level when compared to 68% in 2022. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of lack of foundational skills, implementation of computer-based testing, and influx of new students, we will implement the Targeted Element of Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning.

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

With the implementation of Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning, a minimum of 62% of the third grade students will achieve a level 3 or above as evidenced by the 2024 FAST PM3.

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

Teachers will meet with grade level and set goals for student engagement and achievement. Peer observations will take place and then teachers will reflect and share best practices. Monthly meetings will take place to discuss research-based strategies that target instruction which will improve third grade ELA scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marybel Baldessari (pr2891@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.)

Instructional Support/Coaching will be implemented to address and improve the decisions teachers make about their instruction. By effectively working together to set a measurable goal to improve instructional outcomes, student performance will increase due to the focus on the identified goal.

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

Instructional Support/Coaching will contribute to the overall school improvement by teachers working together to set a measurable goal to improve instructional outcomes. This intervention was chosen since coaching cycles focus on identified goals and increases the achievement and engagement of every student. By using instructional support/coaching, the expected outcome is to bring out the the best performance of every teacher.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

The creation and implementation of a professional learning meeting schedule will be used for teachers to meet and set goals for student engagement and achievement. As a result, teachers will have a clear focus of identified goals.

Person Responsible: Marybel Baldessari (pr2891@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17, 2023

Peer reciprocal observations will take place across grade levels. As a result, teachers will engage in reflective feedback and share best practices.

Person Responsible: Marybel Baldessari (pr2891@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 25, 2023

Monthly grade level meetings to discuss research-based strategies that target instruction. As a result, teachers will use both student-centered and teacher centered methods to help improve the decisions they make about their instruction.

Person Responsible: Marybel Baldessari (pr2891@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17, 2023