Miami Shores Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Miami Shores Elementary School

10351 NE 5TH AVE, Miami Shores, FL 33138

http://miamishoreselementary.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.

The mission of Miami Shores Elementary School is to provide a safe environment that will foster self-directed learning, good citizenship, and high scholastic achievement. We will emphasize parental involvement and encourage the total development of the child within our multi-ethnic population and within our constantly changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Miami Shores Elementary School is committed to providing a challenging, diversified curriculum, and a safe, secure school environment where all students will succeed, regardless of their cultural background and/or socio-economic status. A total school effort will be placed on developing, coordinating, and implementing activities and programs, with the use of technology as the basis of instruction with emphasis on the academic disciplines, to improve student achievement. The staff, parents, and community members envision our students becoming lifelong learners and productive contributors to our society.

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
Daniel, Diaz	Principal	The Principal leads teachers and staff, sets goals, and ensures students are meeting their learning objectives. The Principal oversees the school's daily operations, disciplinary matters, school specific initiatives and programs, manages budget, and hires teachers and other personnel. Logistics, schedules, teachers and staff evaluations, and public relations are some of the responsibilities of a Principal. The Principal and the Leadership Team to set a positive and nurturing school environment to enhance student's academic experience.
Miller, Ashley	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal works closely with the principal to promote a positive caring environment, communicate effectively with students and staff, and coordinate curriculum to ensure that student needs, both academically and socially, are being met. The Assistant Principal supports decisions made by the principal to to ensure the vision and mission of the school is being accomplished.
Delapaz, Ilany	Teacher, K-12	Ms. De La Paz serves as a gifted teacher and teacher leader. As a lead teacher, Ms. De La Paz helps facilitate professional development sessions that are beneficial to teachers in the our school. She serves as one of the contact persons for our school's Cambridge implementation, mentor for new teachers as well as grade level chairperson and a member of our school's developed Schoology squad. Ms. De La Paz is a resourceful educator willing to lead other teachers to help maximize their potential. The Grade Level Team Leaders will ensure that core instruction and collaboration are implemented.
Charles, Thechelet	Teacher, ESE	Mr. Charles serves as an ESE teacher and our school's ESE chairperson. He provides instruction to students based on their needs according to their IEPs. He also works with all general education teachers that have students with IEPs and 504 plans to help guide instructional decisions and strategies necessary to help meet the needs of all learners.

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 to include EESAC members and guests, and PTA members will be informed of the SIP development of Phase 1 and include any additional input for the remaining phases on a monthly basis at scheduled meetings which will be reflected in meeting minutes.

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))

School administration will monitor implementation of the 2023-2024 SIP and discuss monthly at faculty meetings and EESAC meetings. Follow-up and specific feedback for improvement will take place on an on-going basis by the Principal and Assistant Principal.

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	92%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	95%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	5	8	6	8	8	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	3	7	9	2	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	6	12	5	2	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	16	7	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	14	0	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	13	17	13	24	11	0	0	0	79

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	0	3	8	12	6	0	0	0	29

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	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	14	3	13	11	4	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	6	1	18	2	7	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	6	1	13	4	7	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	7	20	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	14	27	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	2	31	10	24	0	0	0	73

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	6	2	21	9	19	0	0	0	57

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	6	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	14	3	13	11	4	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	6	1	18	2	7	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	6	1	13	4	7	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	7	20	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	14	27	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	2	31	10	24	0	0	0	73

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	6	2	21	9	19	0	0	0	57

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	6	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	64	60	53	61	62	56	55		
ELA Learning Gains				68			36		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58			32		
Math Achievement*	63	66	59	54	58	50	39		
Math Learning Gains				62			15		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63			7		
Science Achievement*	33	58	54	39	64	59	27		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	54	63	59	37			37		

* 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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	283
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	442
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	31	Yes	2	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	59			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	92			
FRL	49			

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	54			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	58			

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	54			

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	64			63			33					54
SWD	28			43			13				4	
ELL	46			57			18				5	54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57			54			22				5	44
HSP	64			66			39				5	60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	92			92							2	
FRL	56			58			27				5	46

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	61	68	58	54	62	63	39					37
SWD	21	52	47	15	45	44						
ELL	48	73	54	48	71	71	29					37
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	52	62	63	42	60	63	29					36
HSP	66	76		60	62	64	42					39
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	85	63		93	63		70					
FRL	55	66	64	48	61	65	32					37

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	55	36	32	39	15	7	27					37
SWD	23	27		17	0		20					
ELL	30	21		21	16	20	13					37
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45	31	25	24	9	5	16					33
HSP	60	48		50	15		36					37
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	83			80								
FRL	47	35	31	28	8	8	18					36

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. <u>The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments</u>.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	56%	56%	0%	54%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	58%	17%	58%	17%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2023 - Spring	64%	52%	12%	50%	14%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2023 - Spring	74%	63%	11%	59%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	64%	10%	61%	13%
05	2023 - Spring	45%	58%	-13%	55%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2023 - Spring	32%	50%	-18%	51%	-19%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was the Science Statewide assessment with 32% of our students being proficient. The contributing factors were:

Time Management: 5th grade science teachers attempted to reteach and remediate science standards taught in 3rd or 4th grade while simultaneously teaching 5th grade standards causing pacing to be off resulting in little time to review prior to the science assessment in the Spring.

Essential Labs: Students Thorough planning for essential labs may not have been completed with fidelity creating a lack of confidence from teachers to complete essential labs consistently with their students.

Engagement Opportunities: Creating more opportunities for hand-on science instruction

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 was the Grade 5 Statewide Assessment resulting in only 32% of students being proficient. 5th grade science showed the greatest decline when comparing data from year to the next. Factors that contributed to this decline were: teacher pacing, lack of hands-on labs, missed opportunities to emphasize academic vocabulary, and not enough time spent teaching testing taking strategies.

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 only data component that had gap when compared to the state average was Science, with an almost 20-percentage point gap. Contributing factors have been listed above. ELA and Math Assessments surpassed State averages.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was mathematics, with a 12-percentage point increase from the previous year. This year, we had district math support come to our school and conduct a walkthrough. With the feedback provided, administration spoke with teachers and debriefed the walkthrough providing teachers with look-fors and non-negotiables moving forward.

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

In reflecting on the Early Warning Systems, the major area of concern is student failing grades. During the 2023-2024 school year, our school intends to:

Provide teachers with support on standards aligned grading to ensure appropriate content is being graded and graded correctly based on the 100 point grading scale.

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

Science Labs
Science lessons
Accommodations provided to students with fidelity
MTSS process Intervention

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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

According to the 2022-2023 Statewide Science Assessment, 32% of 5th grade students were proficient as compared to the district average of 52%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: limited implementation of standards based instruction in science across all grade levels and limited opportunities for students to independently complete essential labs, we will implement the Targeted Element of Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning in Science.

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

With successful planning sessions and support with essential labs and Science instruction, 100% of science teachers will complete essential labs on a quarterly basis. By the end of the school year, 100% of teachers will have completed all science quarterly assessments and compare student growth on standards from baseline assessments to quarterly assessments.

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

During collaborative planning sessions, teachers will plan their quarterly essential labs. Administrators will conduct walkthroughs during scientific inquiry labs and review student folders/journals for evidence of essential labs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Miller (ammiller@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.)

Streamlining collaborative planning sessions for Science teachers will provide grade level chairs and teacher leaders the opportunity to discuss and plan for science content. Grade level chairs and teacher leaders will serve as science instructional coaches to guide their respective grade level science teams utilizing information from district resources, pacing guides and information shared from professional development/learning activities.

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

Science in grades K-4 is often touched upon briefly but not taught with fidelity leaving 5th grade teachers the task of playing catch-up on fairgame standards. To ensure science is promoted as a school-wide focus, planning for science across all grade-levels will be promoted, supported and followed-up on by administration.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Create a schedule for instructional planning specifically for science, as result, 100% of teachers school-wide will have opportunities to collaborate while planning for instruction and essential labs.

Person Responsible: Ashley Miller (ammiller@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17, 2023

Administration will provide professional development with teacher leaders showing the process of planning, completing essential labs, and a framework for science instruction. As a result, teachers will gain knowledge and feel empowered and supported when planning and completing science labs.

Person Responsible: Ilany Delapaz (idelapaz@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 15, 2023

Administration will work with teacher leaders to select "model" science classrooms for teachers to conduct teacher-driven observations. As a result, teachers will collaborate and learn best practices to implement.

Person Responsible: Daniel Diaz (mrdiaz1@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 8, 2023

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

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

According to the 2022-2023 EWS data, 34 students have failed an ELA course and 31 failed a Mathematics course. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors, a lack of standards based grading and lack of students being allowed to demonstrate mastery in various forms have been identified. Students' final grades and performance on statewide testing does not correlate, we will implement the Targeted Element of Early Warning Systems to identify students not meeting grade-level requirements and prioritize interventions as necessary. Administration will also conduct gradebook checks to have discussions regarding grading according to grade-level standards based grading.

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

100% of teachers will understand the significance and implications of standards based grading and how to input grades utilizing the 100 point scale.

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

Administration will monitor teacher assignments via Schoology and classroom walkthroughs to ensure students are being graded according to standards based grading criteria.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Diaz (mrdiaz1@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 students failing courses, our school will focus on the evidence based strategy of Response to Early Warning Systems.

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

Response to Early Warning Systems (EWS) involves establishing and implementing a system based on student failing grades data as the academic performance indicator that puts them at risk of dropping out of school. Response to EWS identifies off-track and at-risk students, and targets intervention to address root causes.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

During opening of school professional development teachers will receive concrete examples of student grades versus performances. As a result, teachers will leave with a better understanding and a sample of appropriate standards-aligned grading.

Person Responsible: Ashley Miller (ammiller@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 15, 2023

Administrators will conduct weekly grade book reviews. As a result, accuracy of standard-aligned grading will be evident and necessary conversations will take place if any concerns are raised.

Person Responsible: Daniel Diaz (mrdiaz1@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 25, 2023

During collaborative planning, discuss which assignments should be graded to show student mastery on standards. As a result, teachers will establish a process to review end products from previous week/topic/reading/standard to show how students demonstrated mastery or lack thereof.

Person Responsible: Ashley Miller (ammiller@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 25, 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.

Based on ESSA data, our Students with Disabilities are not meeting state proficiency requirements with a Federal percent of points index of 37 which falls below 41%.

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

Students with disabilities will see an increase in proficiency by 10 percentage points on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking Progress Monitoring 3 (FAST PM3) by June, 2024.

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

The school ESE Chairperson in collaboration with ESE teachers and administration will monitor student IEPs and implementation to ensure students individual needs are being met with aligned support through instruction and support staff placement. Changes to student IEPs and/or support design will be implemented immediately if necessary.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Miller (ammiller@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.)

Differentiation and small group instruction will be the interventions used to enhance SWD proficiency and ensure student's needs are being met according to their IEP and support needed to enhance grade level performance to demonstrate mastery and proficiency.

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

Many SWD are in their least restrictive environment which is inclusion in general education classrooms. By implementing differentiation and small group instruction to students with disabilities, alongside general education students with similar need, students will benefit from teacher led instruction with peers to help enhance grade-level performance and mastery.

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.

Schedule ESE support based on needs of students by grade-level. As a result, all students will be properly serviced according to their Individual Educational Plan (IEP).

Person Responsible: Thechelet Charles (tcharles@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 8, 2023

Meet with teachers of students with IEPs and 504 plans to identify and plan for their individualized needs. As a result, teachers will be able to provide support for specific students and answer ask questions they may have with the ESE team and administration.

Person Responsible: Ashley Miller (ammiller@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 25, 2023

Check in and monitor teacher's implementation of IEP and 504 plans as well as reschedule and align support based on student needs. As a result, SWD will continue to be provided with services needed and instruction based on their IEPs.

Person Responsible: Ashley Miller (ammiller@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 25, 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 feedback from Tour Tuesdays from parents in the community, community stakeholders are not aware of the positive attributes of our school. The perception of our school may not always be reflective of what is actually happening in the building. Feedback from visitors and input from community stakeholders from the local educational advisory board is what prompted this need to help increase student enrollment and establish more community partnerships.

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

Potential parents, and community stakeholders will have a realistic and more positive perception of the school based on efforts put forth to shed a positive outlook on the school and our progress.

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

Surveys will be collected following Tour Tuesdays and administration will attend monthly Miami Shores Village Educational Advisory Board meetings to provide feedback and receive input and suggestions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diaz Daniel (pr3341@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.)

Communicating with Stakeholders

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

Communicating with Stakeholders will be essential in establishing well-designed communication protocols which keep students, parents, stakeholders, and the community abreast of the positive things happening in the school.

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.

Hire full-time Community Involvement Specialist. As a result, community stakeholders will have more opportunities to collaborate directly with Title I services and school support.

Person Responsible: Diaz Daniel (pr3341@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 8, 2023

Create school site team to promote positive school perception. As a result, teachers, staff and stakeholders will have specific contacts to reach out to.

Person Responsible: Ashley Miller (ammiller@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 15, 2023

Meet weekly with community stakeholders and monthly at community Educational Advisory Board (EAB) meetings to collaborate with community stakeholders. As a result, stakeholders will have in depth information related to school initiatives.

Person Responsible: Diaz Daniel (pr3341@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 25, 2023

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

The process of reviewing funding allocations to ensure resources are allocated based on needs includes: Completing a needs assessment to identify school improvement activities and resources needed. At this time any funding is designated to teacher allocations including the teachers responsible for students with disabilities. Any additional funding through EESAC must be presented to EESAC, approved and voted on to use for school improvement activities.

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.

Miami Shores Elementary School will disseminate this SIP via the school's website, hard copies available with the Community Involvement Specialist (CIS) in the main office. The SIP will also be shared and discussed with the community advisory board at monthly meetings, as well as shared and discussed at monthly EESAC meetings. School website: https://miamishoreselementary.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))

Through Tour Tuesdays, we reach parents and community members that are not yet apart of our school family as well as PTA, EESAC and community advisory board meetings to build positive relationships and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

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 plans to strengthen the academic programs in the school by working with teachers to enhance science instruction, utilize district and standards- aligned materials with fidelity and ensure grades are reflective of standards-aligned grading. Students with disabilities SWD will be prioritized and provided appropriate support to strengthen academic programs in the school. Supplemental instruction through before and after school tutoring will also strengthen academic programs within the school.

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))

N/A