

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Miami Gardens Elementary 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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	25
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	30

Miami Gardens Elementary School

4444 NW 195TH ST, Miami Gardens, FL 33055

<http://mgardens.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.

Miami Gardens Elementary School will achieve educational excellence within a safe learning environment that is staffed by highly motivated and qualified teachers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Miami Gardens Elementary enriches its "community of learners" by conveying an atmosphere of high academic standards, respect for cultural diversity and individual difference.

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
John Louissaint, Kathleen	Principal	The role of the Principal is to ensure that all students are provided with a safe learning environment where relevant and rigorous academics are taking place. Additionally, the Principal also ensures that the staff is empowered and engaged in highly effective practices.
Martinez, Niurka	Assistant Principal	The role of the Assistant Principal is to support the Principal in ensuring that all students are provided with a safe learning environment where relevant and rigorous academics are taking place. Additionally, the Assistant Principal also ensures that the staff is empowered and engaged in highly effective practices.
Key, Natre	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach is responsible for collaborating with teachers and Leadership Team members for the purpose of providing teachers with strategies, best practices, and professional development in the area of English Language Arts. The instructional coach also provides mentoring opportunities for novice teachers, and assists with statewide assessments and data analysis..
Hall, Shequilla	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor will assist the teachers with Socio-Emotional Learning (SEL) strategies, participate in the Multi-Tier Support System (MTSS) Team for the purpose of ensuring students are receiving adequate interventions, and communicate with parents to inform them of programs and student progress.
Liguez, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	The teacher will assist the Leadership Team with academic programs as they pertain to Writing and English Language Arts. She will collaborate with the Instructional Coach to ensure that best practices are being shared during faculty meetings, and strategies are being implemented with fidelity.
Gonzalez, Susan	ELL Compliance Specialist	The ELL Compliance Specialist will assist the Leadership Team in ensuring that all English Language Learner (ELL) students receive instruction according to their ESOL level. She will provide teachers with strategies to use in class, and monitor student progress.
Janvier, Ruth	Teacher, K-12	The teacher will assist the Leadership Team with academic programs as they pertain to Mathematics and Science. She will collaborate with the Instructional Coach to ensure that best practices are being shared during faculty meetings, and strategies are being implemented with fidelity.

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.

Stakeholders are an essential component of the learning community and providing feedback towards the School Improvement Process (SIP). Their input is provided through the Educational Excellence School Advisory Committee (EESAC) where components of the SIP are shared along with data to support the decisions made for continuous improvement. During the EESAC meetings, teachers, parents, students, and community business partners vote upon the components of the SIP and come to a consensus on additional action steps needed to support student achievement.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap, by engaging in an on-going data disaggregation process with stakeholders and correlating the achievements or lack of to the action steps outlined on the SIP. This will be done through grade level meetings, data chats, faculty meetings, and EESAC meetings. To ensure continuous improvement, the plan will be revised through analyzing what the areas of concern are and developing new implementation steps that will be purposeful in targeting the areas of focus.

Demographic Data

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	96%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B
	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	6	7	5	6	1	1	0	0	0	26	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	2	0	5	3	4	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	0	3	0	11	3	1	0	0	0	18	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	8	12	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	7	8	0	0	0	23	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	13	8	24	19	9	22	0	0	0	95	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	0	13	8	8	0	0	0	32

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	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	6	10	7	3	3	0	0	0	29	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	1	2	4	2	3	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	5	7	3	0	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	4	7	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	2	3	0	0	0	9	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	6	8	5	8	0	0	0	28	

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	1	3	5	7	4	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	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	0	6	10	7	3	3	0	0	0	29	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	1	2	4	2	3	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	5	7	3	0	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	4	7	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	2	3	0	0	0	9	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	6	8	5	8	0	0	0	28	

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	1	3	5	7	4	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	65	60	53	54	62	56	44		
ELA Learning Gains				54			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44					
Math Achievement*	73	66	59	62	58	50	44		
Math Learning Gains				74			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59					
Science Achievement*	41	58	54	55	64	59	60		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	44	63	59	39			53		

** 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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	291
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	441
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	50			
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	63			
HSP	56			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

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	55			

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	35	Yes	1	
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	62			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	55			

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	65			73			41					44
SWD	42			58							2	
ELL	50			79							4	44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	65			71			40				4	
HSP	62			76			43				5	43
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												
FRL	62			70			36				5	43

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	54	54	44	62	74	59	55					39
SWD	29	40		29	40							
ELL	59	50		71	68		60					39
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	60		50	76		28					
HSP	64	50		70	72		73					41
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	53	55	44	64	74	59	55					39

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	44	41		44	33		60					53
SWD	29			36								
ELL	43	40		45	33		53					53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	38		30	14		55					
HSP	55	42		57	47		61					57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	42	43		43	34		62					53

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	49%	56%	-7%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	58%	8%	58%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	51%	52%	-1%	50%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	62%	63%	-1%	59%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	64%	5%	61%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	61%	58%	3%	55%	6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	38%	50%	-12%	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.

Reading- According to the FAST PM #3 results K-2 (ELA subtest) 30% of second grade students scored on or above grade level, with 58% scoring at a level requiring urgent intervention. Factor contributing to the low performance would be the increase in the number of English Language Learners who entered our school, in particular, the second grade between October and March 2023.

Math- According to the FAST PM #3 Students in grade 3 scored an average scale score of 300 on the mathematics subtest which is two points below the state average. Overall student proficiency was at 51%. A contributing factor was a number of students who registered for the 2022-2023 school year who did not come into third grade having mastered the second grade skills.

Science- According to the NGSSS Science Assessment, 37% of students in grade 5 scored at or above grade level. A contributing factor was the high number of student to teacher ratio. Teachers could not fully implement science hands on curriculum tasks due to the large class size and the influx of English Language Learners throughout the year.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was NGSSS Grade 5 Science Assessment from 55% in 2022 to 37% in 2023, an 18% decline in the number of students scoring proficient level 3 or higher. The factors contributed to the decline include 5th grade students lacked the foundational science skills science, students were not given sufficient opportunities to participate in hands on science tasks and there was an influx of non -English speakers who did not have the academic language to fully understand the questions.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when comparing the state average to the school average, was 5th grade ELA. The contributing factor was the high number of student to teacher ratio. As a result, teachers could not fully implement small group instruction or intervention tasks with fidelity due to the large class size and the influx of non-English Language speakers.

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

Overall the data component that showed the most improvement was ELA in grades 3-5 with a 10 % increase in proficiency when compared to 2022. The contributing factor was the addition of an Academic Recovery Coach for the past two years, the addition of an interventionist, staffing of the ESSER Reading Tutor, additional extended learning opportunities were provided which included additional Saturday school dates, implementation of academic tutoring in our after-school programs, and a self-contained gifted class.

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

Early Warning Systems data shows a need to improve the overall attendance percentage, with a focus on students that are absent 10% of the school year. Another area of concern is with 3rd grade students (16 students) currently demonstrate two or more indicators.

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

The highest priority for school improvement in the upcoming school year include include increasing reading proficiency in rising third grade students from 30% proficient to 65%, through consistent implementation of Differentiated Instruction, ensuring fidelity to the intervention program as will focusing on student engagement and instructional delivery.

Our second priority is to ensure that all teachers in grade K-5 are implementing the science curriculum with fidelity using district resources and science-based text. Also, there is a need to increase support to students in grade 5 which will include conducting science review “boot camps” throughout the year and implementing more STEAM projects.

Our third priority is to provide additional academic support for our non-English speakers in both reading and mathematics.

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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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 FAST STAR PM3 data, 30% of 2nd grade students were proficient in ELA when compared to the state average of 50% and district average of 51%. Based on the data and the following factors: high number of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students, student readiness levels limit abilities to master grade level tasks, we will implement the targeted element of Benchmark-aligned 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 the evidence-based strategy of Scaffolding practices in instruction, an additional 40% of students for a total of 65%) of students in grade 3 will score at or above grade level in the area of ELA on the FAST PM3 assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will conduct quarterly data chats to discuss progress monitoring assessments with real-time data and follow up with regular walkthroughs to ensure that differentiation is aligned to current data. Administrators will review lesson plans for differentiation. Teachers will implement student data trackers. This data will be analyzed during Leadership Team meetings and data chats with teachers. Extended learning opportunities will be provided to those students who are not showing growth on OPMs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathleen John Louissaint (pr3241@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.)

Within the Targeted Element of Benchmark-aligned instruction, our school will focus on the Evidence-based Intervention of: Scaffolding. Scaffolding will assist with gradually building the students' knowledge by planning with their data in mind and meeting students where they are. Data-Driven instruction will be monitored through the use of data trackers to drive instructional planning and data driven conversations to include OPMs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Scaffolding is a teaching method that enables a student to solve a problem, carry out a task or achieve a goal through a gradual shedding of outside assistance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

8/14-9/29: Provide opportunities for teachers to observe and share practices of effective implementation of scaffolding that is aligned to relevant student data. As a result, teachers will identify best practices that are appropriate for student success.

Person Responsible: Niurka Martinez (martinezn@dadeschools.net)

By When: (8/14/2023-9/29/2023)

8/14-9/29: Teachers will develop lesson plans that address students' areas of deficiencies. As a result, teachers will have student groups, use district approved appropriate resources, and lesson plans that reflect differentiation within the whole group instruction as well as within small groups.

Person Responsible: Natre Key (nkey60@dadeschools.net)

By When: (8/14/2023-9/29/2023)

8/14-9/29: Teachers will attend weekly collaborative planning meetings to collaborate and brainstorm challenges, needs, and shared best practices.

Person Responsible: Natre Key (nkey60@dadeschools.net)

By When: (8/14/2023-9/29/2023)

#2. 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 2022-2023 end of the year Student Climate Survey, Q.03, 20% of students disagreed and 41% responded neutral, when asked if they believed that students in our school followed school rules. Based on the data and the limited implementation of the character education programs, we will implement the targeted element of "Other".

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of the evidence-based strategy of character education programs, the results of the 2023-2024 Student Climate Survey will show that at least 60% of students will respond positively when asked if they believed that students in our school followed school rules.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will monitor the decline of the number of students who receive referrals and the increase in the number of students that are nominated and recognized by faculty and staff through the various character education programs established by district and an increase in the number of students receiving quarterly citizenship awards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shequilla Hall (shall1@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence based intervention of character education will be small group sessions with the counselor. The establishment of the No Place for Hate club, Peace Path and the Mentor and Mentee program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Character Education/Values Matter is an educational movement that supports the social, emotional, and ethical development of students. It is the proactive effort by schools, districts, and states to instill in students important core, ethical, and performance values such as caring, honesty, diligence, fairness, fortitude, responsibility, and respect for self and others. Character Education/Values Matter provides long-term solutions to moral, ethical, and academic issues that are of growing concern in our society and our schools. Character Education/Values Matter teaches students how to be their best selves and how to do their best work.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

8/14-9/29: Develop a school wide character education program that recognizes students monthly, "Conqueror of the Month."

Person Responsible: Shequilla Hall (shall1@dadeschools.net)

By When: (8/14/2023-9/29/2023)

8/14-9/29: Reviewing the grade proof report and identifying the students who earned A on their report card and recognizing those students during honor roll assembly.

Person Responsible: Kathleen John Louissaint (pr3241@dadeschools.net)

By When: (8/14/2023-9/29/2023)

8/14-9/29: Participate in the "Do the Right Thing" character education program sponsored by the City of Miami Police Department that recognizes students who demonstrate good citizenship.

Person Responsible: Shequilla Hall (shall1@dadeschools.net)

By When: (8/14-2023-9/29/2023)

#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 PM3 Data, Students with Disabilities (SWD) were the lowest achieving subgroup at 40% percent proficiency in the areas of English Language Arts (ELA). Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of inconsistent progress monitoring and intervention, we will implement the targeted element 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 the evidence-based strategy of ongoing progress monitoring, the Students with Disabilities subgroup will achieve at least 41 percent proficiency as reported by the 2024 ELA PM3 results.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team will conduct quarterly data chats with teachers and attend consultation meetings with the homeroom teacher and Special Education teacher to ensure that students needs are being met. Data analysis of i-Ready Assessment Period 1 (AP1), FAST PM1 Assessments, Topic Assessment Data from Performance Matters, Reading Horizons progress monitoring assessments, and i-Ready Growth Monitoring data will be used to ensure students are making adequate progress throughout the school year. Extended learning opportunities will be made available to students who are not showing growth on progress monitoring, or i-Ready growth monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Esquijarosa (317818@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.)

Within the targeted element of ESSA, as it relates to Students with Disabilities, our school will focus on the evidence-based intervention of: ongoing progress monitoring. Student performance data in the areas of i-Ready Assessment Period 1 (AP1), Topic Assessment Data from Performance Matters, Reading Horizons progress monitoring assessments, and i-Ready Growth Monitoring data will be used to ensure students are making adequate progress and guide instructional planning and delivery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) is used to assess students' academic performance, to quantify a student rate of improvement or responsiveness to instruction, and to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction. OPM can be implemented with individual students or an entire class.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

8/14-9/29: Teachers will utilize the Reading Horizons intervention program daily in grades K-5th. As a result, targeted lessons will be provided in the areas of phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, and comprehension skills.

Person Responsible: Natre Key (nkey60@dadeschools.net)

By When: (8/17/2023-9/29/2023)

8/14-9/29: Teachers will collaborate with administrators and Leadership Team quarterly to discuss student progress and learning targets outlined in the student's Individualized Education Plan (IEP). As a result, teacher will adjust teaching methods according to student progress.

Person Responsible: Niurka Martinez (martinezn@dadeschools.net)

By When: (8/17/2023-9/29/2023)

8/14-9/29: Administrators will conduct bi-weekly walkthroughs to ensure that instructional time is being maximized. As a result, this will enable teachers to use data to drive instruction and make informed decisions relating to goal setting, interventions, course work, and differentiating instruction.

Person Responsible: Jessica Esquijarosa (317818@dadeschools.net)

By When: (8/17/2023-9/29/2023)

#4. 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 PM3 Data, ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 was at 55%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of lack of differentiated instruction, will implement the targeted element of ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of the evidence-based strategy of differentiated instruction, an additional 10% of students, 65%, in grades 3-5 will score at or above grade level in the area of ELA as reported by the 2024 FAST ELA PM3 Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team will conduct weekly walkthroughs for the purpose of monitoring instructional delivery of differentiated instruction in the ELA in classrooms. The Leadership Team will discuss observations from the field and make recommendations on how instructional coaches and administration can support teachers and DI.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathleen John Louissaint (pr3241@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 monitored weekly through walkthroughs. In addition, student data from topic assessments will be reviewed to determine the effectiveness of the strategy. Administration and coaches will provide feedback to teachers and continue to monitor the fidelity of the strategy and its effectiveness.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

8/14-9/29: Coaches will provide grade levels and teachers with evidence and suggestions on how to utilize the current ELA resources to provide differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Jessica Liguez (277004@dadeschools.net)

By When: (8/17/2023-9/29/2023)

8/14-9/29: Administration and coaches will attend grade level meetings to examine teachers' lessons and whether these reflect differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Natre Key (nkey60@dadeschools.net)

By When: (8/17/2023-9/29/2023)

8/14/9/29: Walkthroughs will ascertain the fidelity of lessons that reflect differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Niurka Martinez (martinezn@dadeschools.net)

By When: (8/17/2023-9/29/2023)

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

Title I Federal funding is used to purchase personnel such as our Instructional Coach. Additionally, Title III resources are used to provide English Language Learners (ELL) students with supplemental tutoring. The afterschool TALENTS program provides students with opportunities to receive remediation on daily lessons and skills, as well as learn about the arts. Saturday Academy is also offered to students in grades 3-5 from February to April.

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

2023 STAR Literacy assessment (PM3) indicated that 50% of students in Kindergarten and 53% of students in first grade scored below the 40th percentile on PM3. Based on the data and the identified

contributing factors of foundational skills in Reading, we will implement the targeted element of ELA in grades K-2.

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

2023 FAST PM3 data indicated that 43% of 3rd grade students, 24% of 4th grade students, and 44% of 5th grade students did not meet standards in the area of ELA. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of lack of student data-chats and student subject content knowledge, we will implement the targete element of ELA in grades 3-5.

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

With the implementation of the evidence-based strategy of anchor charts, our Kindergarten-2nd grade students will increase their overall proficiency by 15 percentile points as evidenced by the results of the 2024 Star Literacy Assessment (PM3).

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

With the implementation of the evidence-based strategy of accountable talk, our 3rd-5th grade students will increase their overall ELA proficiency by 10 percentile points as evidenced by the results of the 2024 FAST ELA Assessment (PM3).

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.

Academic Instructional coach will collaboratively plan with teachers to demonstrate the use of anchor charts and student accountable talk while planning and implementing the (B.E.S.T.) standards. Pacing guides will be used and ELA resources will be identified for the purpose of providing students with strategic lessons to enhance learning. Additionally, the Leadership Team will take part in classroom walkthroughs to ensure fidelity to interventions, pacing guides and the use of accountable talk.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Martinez, Niurka, martinezn@dadeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

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

Anchor Charts serve as artifacts of classroom learning. Like an anchor, they holds students' and teachers' thoughts, in alignment to standards and skills, as well as ideas and processes in place. Anchor charts can be displayed as reminders of prior learning and built upon over multiple lessons.

Accountable Talk refers to discussion that is meaningful, respectful, and mutually beneficial to both speaker and listener to develop a mindset of a reflective learner. Students learn how to respectfully defend their answers. Accountable Talk stimulates higher-order and critical thinking—helping students to learn, reflect on their learning, and communicate their knowledge and understanding of classroom content. Accountable Talk is not limited to physical Turn and Talk or collaborative groups; virtual platform features and/or devices can also be utilized.

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?

Anchor Charts serve as artifacts of classroom learning. Like an anchor, they holds students' and teachers' thoughts, in alignment to standards and skills, as well as ideas and processes in place. Anchor charts can be displayed as reminders of prior learning and built upon over multiple lessons.

Accountable Talk refers to discussion that is meaningful, respectful, and mutually beneficial to both speaker and listener to develop a mindset of a reflective learner. Students learn how to respectfully defend their answers. Accountable Talk stimulates higher-order and critical thinking—helping students to learn, reflect on their learning, and communicate their knowledge and understanding of classroom content. Accountable Talk is not limited to physical Turn and Talk or collaborative groups; virtual platform features and/or devices can also be utilized.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
8/14-9/23: Academic Instructional Coach will collaborate with teachers for planning and identifying resources from the pacing guides to ensure students are making progress.	Key, Natre, nkey60@dadeschools.net
8/14-9/29: Instructional coach will guide teachers in implementing anchor charts and accountable talk. The coach will facilitate collaborative planning sessions to demonstrate how to analyze assessment data to adjust instruction and engage students in accountable dialogue.	Key, Natre, nkey60@dadeschools.net
8/14-9/29: Conduct data chats with KG-5 grade students to analyze 2022-2023 Star Literacy/FAST PM3 data, and identify students' needs.	John Louissaint, Kathleen, pr3241@dadeschools.net
8/14-9/29: Selected teachers will share best practices utilizing anchor charts and accountable talk across grade levels during monthly faculty meetings. Teachers will have the opportunity to collaboratively discuss successful strategies and resources across grade levels. This collaborative exchange will foster a culture of shared insights and joint problem-solving.	John Louissaint, Kathleen, pr3241@dadeschools.net

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

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

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

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

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) can be disseminated to stakeholders through various channels. These include sharing documents on the school's website, sending newsletters and emails to parents in clear language, conducting parent meetings with translated materials and interpretation services, engaging staff through meetings and updates, collaborating with local businesses and organizations, and utilizing multiple communication channels. This comprehensive approach ensures widespread

understanding and involvement while providing accessible information to all stakeholders. Stakeholders can access all available information on our website at www.miamigardenselem.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))

Administrators will be easily accessible each day by begin present at the opening and closing of each school day so that parents can speak with them if they have any concerns. Additionally, the administrators will ensure that parents are informed by providing parents with on-going communication from the school through email, flyers, letters and/or school messenger phone calls about school events, operations, upcoming academic meetings or activities that parents can engage in that will benefit their child. Additionally, teachers will communicate with parents through letters, e-mails, phone calls, meetings and apps on an on-going basis regarding their child's progress. Stakeholders can access all available information on our website at www.miamigardenselem.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)

A comprehensive plan to strengthen the academic program includes, increase learning time by providing opportunities for students to participate in extended learning opportunities. Providing opportunities for staff to participate in professional development for a better understanding of B.E.S.T standards, , and the implementation of an enriched curriculum that will to improve student learning outcomes. Part II of the SIP outlines the specific area of focus and corresponding goals, objectives, and strategies to address the unique needs of the school community.

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

Title I Federal funding is used to purchase personnel such as our Instructional Coach. Additionally, Title III resources are used to provide English Language Learners (ELL) students with supplemental tutoring. Additionally, the afterschool TALENTS program provides students with opportunities to receive remediation on daily lessons and skills, as well as learn about the arts. Saturday Academy is also offered to students in grades 3-5 from February to April.

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))

Not Applicable

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))

Not Applicable

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).

Not Applicable

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))

Not Applicable

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))

Not Applicable

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: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$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