

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Frank Crawford Martin 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	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	25
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	30

Frank Crawford Martin K 8 Center

14250 BOGGS DR, Miami, FL 33176

<http://fcmartin.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.

All stakeholders are committed to the advancement of students' academic, emotional, social and physical well being within a supportive, creative and flexible environment in which children learn to think globally and act compassionately.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Frank C. Martin International K-8 Center provides students with an internationally recognized curriculum. This challenging curriculum incorporates world-class standards that empower students to actively participate in the learning process and acquire and exhibit positive attitudes. Students strive to become model citizens of our diverse world.

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
Basulto, Elianeys	Principal	Oversee all aspects of the school curriculum. Guides the leadership team in curricular decisions and areas of focus. Leads school leader instructional walk throughs and identifies areas of need for the teachers and students. Leads data discussions and assist teachers develop strategies to address the needs of the learners
	Assistant Principal	Supports the principal in all aspects of curriculum. Conducts walkthroughs with the leadership team to help identify areas of academic need. Assists the principal develop strategies to address learner needs and provide guidance to teachers.
Capodiferro, Katheryn	Magnet Coordinator	Supports the administrative team with all aspects of the International Baccalaureate Curriculum. Works with the leadership team in supporting teachers with instructional strategies and the development of cross curricular IB Unit Planners.
Almagro, Tania	School Counselor	Supports the administrative team with the MTSS process and all Social and Emotional Learning of the students.
Rackley, Chale	School Counselor	Supports the administrative team with the MTSS process and all Social and Emotional Learning of the students.
McKnight, Don	Assistant Principal	Supports the principal in all aspects of curriculum. Conducts walkthroughs with the leadership team to help identify areas of academic need. Assists the principal develop strategies to address learner needs and provide guidance to teachers.
Williams, Melissa	Instructional Coach	Supports the teachers through instructional coaching and support. Completes data analysis in the areas of Reading and Science and provide teachers with instructional tools to assist students.
Ramirez, Karin	School Counselor	Supports the administrative team with the MTSS process and all Social and Emotional Learning of the students. Monitors attendance and documents attendance.

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.

Members of the school leadership team and select faculty meet during the summer to analyze the recent academic and school culture data. Through a collaborative process, a draft School Improvement Plan (SIP) is created and prepared for stakeholder review. The draft SIP is first shared to all faculty and staff via email and then presented during the initial regular faculty meeting of the year. Then, the SIP will be presented to EESAC during its first meeting. During the presentations to the faculty and EESAC, feedback will be considered and included in the final revision. After a district review process, the final SIP submitted to the School Board for approval. Once the final approval has been given, the SIP will be placed on the Website for all stakeholders to review.

SIP Monitoring

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

The school leadership team and EESAC will review the SIP according to district timelines. The school site will review relevant student performance data, ie.. assessment scores and attendance in relation to SIP goals. During monthly faculty meetings and quarterly EESAC meetings, the SIP will remain a standing agenda item and progress toward goals presented. During Phase III and Phase IV, the School Leadership Team will conduct a formal review process of action steps, evaluate their effectiveness toward meeting goals, and add action steps as needed.

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	97%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	91%
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) Multiracial Students (MUL)

	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	6	9	4	5	4	2	5	8	43	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	4	0	8	
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	2	0	1	2	2	5	14	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	3	15	16	12	8	59	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	6	16	9	14	13	60	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	8	10	6	19	22	29	19	116	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	1	6	1	6	7	9	7	38

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	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	5	12	5	11	3	6	6	4	9	61	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	0	15	23	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	9	5	11	13	16	71	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	14	9	17	15	24	96	
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		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	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	14	9	7	10	15	14	69

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

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	6	11	3	6	4	2	6	9	5	52	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	1	2	1	0	0	4	0	3	11	
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	1	1	2	3	5	2	17	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	15	16	15	7	16	77	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	16	12	14	13	14	77	
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		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	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	3	9	5	12	18	25	32	18	25	147

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	1	6	6	8	10	7	8	48
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	61	61	53	62	62	55	62		
ELA Learning Gains				59			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			39		
Math Achievement*	59	63	55	59	51	42	46		
Math Learning Gains				71			26		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68			24		
Science Achievement*	43	56	52	58	60	54	47		
Social Studies Achievement*	79	77	68	89	68	59	67		
Middle School Acceleration	83	75	70	82	61	51	71		
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress		62	55	69	75	70	83		

** 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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	390
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	669
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	27	Yes	2	1
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	60			
HSP	71			
MUL	79			
PAC				

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%
WHT	94			
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	37	Yes	1	
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	65			
HSP	67			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	65			

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	61			59			43	79	83			
SWD	21			33							2	
ELL	67			54							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55			56			40	72	83		6	
HSP	71			60			41	90	74		6	

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
MUL	75			83							2	
PAC												
WHT	88			100							2	
FRL	58			53			35	74	84		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	62	59	52	59	71	68	58	89	82			69
SWD	21	32	33	25	58	50						
ELL	56	46		63	73		43					69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57	56	53	53	69	70	52	91	83			
HSP	65	61	46	66	74	62	62	86	76			67
MUL	88	83		75	75							
PAC												
WHT	88	75		87	71							
FRL	57	59	52	53	69	68	50	90	84			64

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	62	53	39	46	26	24	47	67	71			83
SWD	27	41	42	22	12	20						
ELL	45	54	50	45	18		38	30				83
AMI												
ASN	87	67		73	42							
BLK	58	53	42	40	28	28	40	60	70			
HSP	65	53	37	49	20	9	52	68	66			75
MUL	60	40		53	20							
PAC												
WHT	83	52		91	45		82					

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
FRL	55	50	38	39	24	21	39	59	64			79

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	54%	56%	-2%	54%	0%
07	2023 - Spring	68%	50%	18%	47%	21%
08	2023 - Spring	74%	51%	23%	47%	27%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	58%	0%	58%	0%
06	2023 - Spring	56%	50%	6%	47%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	67%	52%	15%	50%	17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	47%	58%	-11%	54%	-7%
03	2023 - Spring	74%	63%	11%	59%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	64%	-1%	61%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	61%	59%	2%	55%	6%
05	2023 - Spring	58%	58%	0%	55%	3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	33%	40%	-7%	44%	-11%
05	2023 - Spring	35%	50%	-15%	51%	-16%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	56%	27%	50%	33%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	52%	48%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	65%	31%	63%	33%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	68%	12%	66%	14%

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.

According to the FAST PM 3 data, the area of greatest concern is 6th Grade. During the 22-23 school year, the 5th grade cohort scored a 54% proficiency in Reading and 59% proficiency in Math. The Reading scores were equal to state averages of 53% proficiency and slightly below the district averages of 57% proficiency. The Math scores were slightly above the state average of 55% proficiency and the district average of 57%. During the 2020-2021 school year, about 50% of this cohort attended school online for 3rd grade. Those students that attended physically, experience frequent quarantines leading to inconsistent instruction during a critical grade level. Upon returning physically during the 2021-2022 school year, many of the students experienced difficulties adjusting to school physically. As a result of inconsistent instructions during their 3rd grade and 4th grade years lead to learning gaps for this cohort.

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

The Science scores indicated the greatest decline from the 2021-2022 school year. On the 2023 Science Assessment, 33% of the 5th Grade students scored proficient, a decline of 23% proficiency as compared to the 2022 5th Grade Science assessment of 56%. 8th Grade students scored 33% proficient, a 5%

decrease from the 2022 8th Grade assessment of 38%. Factors that contributed to the decline stem from the low reading proficiency of the students. A majority of the science assessment involves reading the question, determining what information is provided, and then developing an answer. The 5th and 8th grade students who participated in the Science assessments may have struggled with both the science content and the analysis required to solve the problem correctly.

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.

All grade levels except for 6th Grade Mathematics scored at or above the State average. The Average score for 6th Grade Mathematics was 325, and the State average was 326 and the District average was 328. 47% of the 6th Grade students scored proficient as oppose to 55% for the State, and 59% for the district. The 6th grade math teacher is a second year teacher and is developing and needs additional coaching in order to deliver solid instruction. In addition, the core math skills need to be reinforced throughout the school year in order to maintain basic proficiency and remain fluent in foundational math skills.

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

8th Grade ELA represents the greatest increase in data. In 2022, the cohort of students demonstrated a 58% proficiency rate as indicated by the 2022 FSA. In 2023, the students scored a 74% proficiency rate, an increase in 16% over 1 year. The students received 2 years of consistent instruction in ELA and the 8th grade teacher provided a positive learning environment.

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

The rising 6th grade cohort remains the greatest area of concern. The students earned a 54% proficiency rate in Reading and a 59% proficiency rate in Mathematics. The 6th grade will be divided between 2 teachers and will need instructional consistency among the two instructors. The math teachers will need to ensure that systems are developed to continually monitor the progress of the students, identify the student needs, and differentiate where needed.

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

1. 6th Grade Reading
2. 6th Grade Math
3. 3rd Grade Reading
4. 5th Grade Science
5. 8th Grade Science

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 the 2023 FAST PM 3 data, 5th grade scored a 54% proficiency in Reading. The Reading scores were equal to state averages (53% proficiency) and slightly below the district averages (57% proficiency). During the 2020-2021 school year, approximately 50% of this cohort attended school online for 3rd grade. The students that attended physically, experienced frequent quarantines leading to inconsistent instruction during a critical grade level. Upon returning physically during the 2021-2022 school year, many of the student experienced difficulties adjusting to school physically. As a result of inconsistent instructions during their 3rd and 4th grade years and the need for targeted instruction, we will implement the Targeted Element of Collaborative Data Chats.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Collaborative Data Chats, 65% of the 23- 24 6th Grade cohort will earn a Level 3 or higher on the FAST PM 3 assessment in May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

All students will participate in the FAST Reading PM1 assessment and the iReady Reading AP1 Diagnostic assessment. In addition, teachers will receive identified lowest 25 quartile students and a list of recommended Tiered Intervention students. Identified students will then participate in district progress monitoring assessments, iReady Progress Monitoring assessments and Mid-Year Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elianeys Basulto (247915@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.)

Collaborative Data chats will be conducted by each grade level bi-monthly. During the data chats, members of the school leadership team and the teachers will identify the areas of need and the district resources that will address the identified standard.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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. Collaboration allows teachers to pool their collective knowledge of pedagogy and instructional resources to address the identified needs of the students. During the meetings, the leadership team may identify any additional resources to assist the instructional staff reach their goals.

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.

Members of the School Based Leadership will receive an iReady overview training that outlines the new features of the program and the best reports for beginning of the school year.

Person Responsible: Elianeys Basulto (247915@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 24, 2023

The Reading Coach will present to the faculty iReady updates and a brief over view of the plan for the 23-24 school year. The test chairperson will also include some important guidelines for administering the Diagnostic Assessments.

Person Responsible: Melissa Williams (279003@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 30, 2023

Students will participate in the iReady AP1 Diagnostic and the FAST PM 1 Assessment. Once completed, Collaborative Data Chats will be scheduled.

Person Responsible: Tania Almagro (talmagro@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 5, 2023 - 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 FAST PM 3 data, an area of concern is 5th and 8th Grade Science. The 5th Graders scored a 33% proficiency in science. The 5th Grade Science scores were below the district average of 50% and the State average of 51%. The 8th graders scored a 33% proficiency in science. The 8th grade science scores were below the district average of 40% and the State average of 44%. Based upon the data and the need for targeted instruction of the Science Benchmarks, we will implement the Targeted Element of Data Driven Instruction.

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 Instruction, 50% of the 5th and 8th Grade students will earn a Level 3 or higher on the 2024 Science Assessment in Many 2024.

Monitoring:

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

The 5th and 8th grade students will participate in baseline assessment during the first week of school to provide teachers with initial data. As the school year progresses, the 5th and 8th grade students will participate in district topic assessments and the Science Mid-year assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Williams (279003@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 Instruction is an educational approach that relies on the teacher's use of student performance data to inform instructional planning and delivery. This systematic approach of instruction uses assessment, analysis, and actions to meet students needs. As the students participate in regular assessments, the teachers develop their most effective classroom strategies for teaching the standards and benchmarks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The science assessment test student knowledge over a several year period and data driven instruction allows teachers to determine what standards and benchmarks the students have already mastered and so they may focus on the critical standards.

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 students will participate in the Science Baseline assessment in order to gather student knowledge of assessed standards.

Person Responsible: Tania Almagro (talmagro@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 1, 2023

The leadership team will analyze the data to determine the greatest area of need and develop an intervention plan for the Science Coach.

Person Responsible: Elianeys Basulto (247915@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 8, 2023

The Science Coach will present to the faculty the schoolwide STEAM school plan. The plan will be designed to support the science program across all grade levels.

Person Responsible: Melissa Williams (279003@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

#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.

According to the 2023 FAST PM 3 data, 12% of students with disabilities were proficient in ELA as compared to 63% for Frank C. Martin K-8 students, 53% state proficiency, and 57% district average. Additionally, 36% of students with disabilities scored proficient as compared to 61% of all Frank C. Martin K-8 students, 55% state average, and district averages of 57%. This data indicates a significant gap between students with disabilities and their peers. As a full inclusion school, all students with disabilities learn along side their peers in general education classrooms. Teachers must use the Targeted Element of Differentiated Instruction in order to meet the education needs of students with disabilities.

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, 41% of the students with disabilities will score proficient on the 2024 FAST Reading PM3 Assessment and 45% of the students with disabilities will score proficient on the 2024 FAST Math PM3 Assessment by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will monitor student achievement level after each FAST and iReady progress monitoring assessment. The assistant principal will create a report group in iReady for all of the students with disabilities in order to pull reports after each diagnostic and progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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 is a framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of: acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability. Research demonstrates this method benefits a wide range of students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students with disabilities may have different learning needs in order to access the grade level materials. Differentiated lessons provides that access to the grade level standard with their disability in mind.

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.

All general education teachers will receive an electronic copy of IEP's from the ESE teacher.

Person Responsible: Diana Makhoul (dianamakhoul@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 25, 2023

All students with disabilities will be identified through file download manager and report groups created in iReady to monitor diagnostic assessments and Progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: September 15, 2023

The ESE teacher will create a schedule for support and assist teachers with differentiation strategies for students with disabilities.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: September 15, 2023

#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 School Climate Survey, an area of concern is that 57% of teachers feel students are deficient in basic academic skills. Those students that attended physically, experienced frequent quarantines leading to inconsistent instruction. Upon returning physically during the 2021-2022 school year, many of the students experienced difficulties adjusting to school physically and inconsistent instruction. During this time, the school's vision and mission were often overshadowed by the daily operational needs and teachers and students lost connection to the school as an institution, thereby . In order to return to rebuild a strong school culture and academic program, we will implement the Targeted Element of Shared Vision/Mission.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Shared Vision and Mission, 70% of the teachers will feel that the students are proficient in basic academic skills by May 2024 as reflected on the 2024 School Climate Survey.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through the use of Mid-Year and end of year school climate surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Shared Vision/Mission is when a school community has a unique mission statement that speaks to the beliefs, values, and aims of the learning community. When the Shared Vision and Mission are authentically embedded in a school's practice, and when students, staff, and community members stay true to the Shared Vision and Mission, a school remains bound together by a common drive and is united in its success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As the teachers support the vision and mission and this translate into greater student success, a positive school climate will begin to emerge.

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.

During the opening of schools meeting with the teachers, the school leadership team will share the Vision and Mission of the school and discuss the theme for the upcoming school year.

Person Responsible: Elianeys Basulto (247915@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14, 2023

The faculty social club will be reinstated, members recruited, and after school activities to increase teacher morale planned for the school year.

Person Responsible: Elianeys Basulto (247915@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 14, 2023

During monthly faculty meetings, members of the school leadership team will highlighted teacher and student success and relate back to the Vision and Mission of the school.

Person Responsible: Elianeys Basulto (247915@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 5, 2023 and October 3, 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).

Through the School Improvement Planning process, Frank C. Martin K-8 Center will identify its strengths, weaknesses, and student performance data to pinpoint areas requiring improvement. Collaboratively, the school community develops an Area(s) of Focus, outlining specific interventions and activities within the School Improvement Plan (SIP). This plan is grounded in evidence-based practices and tailored to address the unique needs of the school. Regular assessments and progress monitoring are conducted to gauge the effectiveness of interventions and to make necessary adjustments, ensuring that resources are effectively and equitably allocated to foster student growth and achievement.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

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

N/A

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring**Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

NA

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The School Improvement Plan (SIP), Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) budget, and Schoolwide Program (SWP) information will be effectively disseminated to all stakeholders. Regular communication channels such as monthly calendars, school website updates, and emails will be utilized to provide summaries of the SIP goals, interventions, and progress updates. Additionally, parent-teacher conferences and community engagement events will offer opportunities for in-person discussions, ensuring understanding and addressing questions. During PTA meetings, administration will present SIP goals and updates and engage in dialogue with any stakeholders who may have questions. Finally, the SIP will be presented to the EESAC body during its 4 regular meetings and posted on the school website <https://fcmartink8.net/>.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school is dedicated to cultivating strong, positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders to fulfill its mission and enhance student success. The schools annual meet and greet, open house, monthly PTA events, parent-teacher conferences, and family engagement workshops will be held to foster meaningful interactions and mutual understanding between educators and families. Additionally, the school will utilize digital platforms such as Schoology, Class dojo, and the electronic gradebook to provide real-time updates on students' progress, homework assignments, and extracurricular activities. This concerted effort to build transparent and supportive relationships with stakeholders will create a harmonious and effective learning community that prioritizes the holistic development of every student. The school's family engagement plan will be posted on the school website @ <https://fcmartink8.net/>.

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

The school is committed to enhancing its academic program by implementing a multifaceted approach aimed at increasing both the quantity and quality of learning time for students while offering an enriched and accelerated curriculum. The implementation of extended learning opportunities, such as after-school tutoring programs will extend students' exposure to educational experiences. In the Area of Focus of Science, the school will strive for STEAM Gold designation and include enrichment activities during the school day as well as afterschool. The science coach will provide push in and pull out support for students struggling with identified benchmarks. The school will host several STEAM events that include parental participation. Additionally, the integration of technology-driven tools and project-based learning approaches will further enrich the curriculum and develop critical thinking. Through these initiatives, the school aims to provide a well-rounded and rigorous academic experience that nurtures students' intellectual growth and prepares them for future success.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

This plan is intricately developed through seamless coordination and integration with various Federal, State, and local services, resources, and programs. All local services will be considered when new initiatives are developed at the school site.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Frank C. Martin K-8 Center ensures a comprehensive range of support services by maintaining a dedicated team of trained counselors who provide both individual and group counseling to address emotional well-being, stress management, and personal development. Outside community partnerships

provide personalized support through mentorship programs such as Girl Power, 100 Black Men of South Florida, and the 5000 Role Models.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Frank C. Martin K-8 Center is dedicated to equipping students with a keen awareness of diverse pathways for their future. Through initiatives like the annual magnet fair held in October, the school actively promotes high school programs tailored for post-secondary success. The fair serves as a platform to spotlight school choice programs and opportunities through the public schools. Moreover, the school organizes two distinct occasions, Men of Distinction and Career Day, inviting accomplished professionals to engage with students directly, sharing insights from their journeys in the postsecondary workforce. By facilitating these informative interactions, Frank C. Martin K-8 Center empowers students to make informed decisions about their educational and career trajectories.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

The school has established a comprehensive schoolwide tiered model to effectively prevent and address problem behavior. This model involves multiple tiers of support, starting with Tier 1 universal strategies applied to all students, including social-emotional learning programs taught by student services staff and behavior expectations. Teachers and students develop essential agreements to set the expectations for the classroom and guide the culture in the classroom. For those needing additional supports, Tier 2 targeted interventions are provided through small-group counseling, mentorship, and behavior intervention plans. For students requiring more intensive support, Tier 3 individualized services are offered in collaboration with specialists, parents, and external resources.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

The school places a strong emphasis on fostering continuous professional growth among its educators and staff, which includes teachers, paraprofessionals, and other vital personnel. This commitment is evident through the regular implementation of training sessions, workshops, and collaborative activities aimed at refining instructional techniques and promoting the effective utilization of data derived from academic assessments. After assessment periods like iReady Diagnostic Assessments, FSAT Progress Monitoring, or District Mid-Year assessments, the school's leadership team engages with each grade level or tested subject area to discern areas requiring improvement and collaboratively develops targeted solutions. Additionally, recognizing the value of skilled educators, the school takes deliberate steps to both attract and retain them. This is accomplished by cultivating a supportive environment facilitated by practices such as shared planning time and teacher mentorship programs. Through these cohesive efforts, the school ensures not only the professional development of its staff but also the delivery of exceptional education for all its students.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

The school uses various strategies to help preschool children transition smoothly from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. These include meet and greet session where

children and their families visit the elementary school, meet the teacher, and explore the classroom. The school also creates an opportunities for the preschool and kindergarten teacher to collaborate and share information about each child's needs and strengths. Additionally, the preschoolers interact with the other members of the student body during lunch time in the cafeteria and whole school activities.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$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: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No