
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	18
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Keys Gate Charter School

2000 SE 28TH AVE, Homestead, FL 33035

<http://www.keyscharter.org/>

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.

We, the Knights, are empowered to choose our own personalized college and career pathway.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Keys Gate Knights will have access and opportunity to become locally engaged and globally connected. Our Knights will be prepared to thrive in a diverse and ever-changing world.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Baez, Corinne	Principal	
Barroso, Yadira	Principal	
Beltran, Sandra	Dean	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The development of the School Improvement Plan is process involving the students, staff, faculty, and leadership team. The team analyzes the student performance data to create academic goals for improvement. We also create culture and climate goals to ensure all stakeholders have a positive experience throughout the school year.

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 leadership team monitors the SIP regularly throughout the year conducting weekly walkthroughs, analyzing ongoing data, PLC meetings to ensure that we are driving instructions with fidelity and supporting our teachers through professional development.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	97%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	79%
Charter School	Yes
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	2	3	5	2	4	6	9	8	39
One or more suspensions	14	11	5	7	12	17	24	23	23	136
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	4	11	15	27	16	20	15	20	40	168
Course failure in Math	7	13	11	41	36	40	46	44	30	268
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	70	69	74	74	77	102	466
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	49	52	85	53	53	67	359
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	8	5	35	7	8	10	12	16	107

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	7	9	4	37	21	44	47	49	220

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	6	11	8	22	6	1	0	4	11	69
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	2	3	2	2	0	12

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	1	3	4	5	3	7	8	9	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	2	1	9
Course failure in ELA	7	11	6	49	22	22	6	44	3	170
Course failure in Math	7	9	4	33	38	22	39	35	76	263
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	55	62	59	50	72	75	373
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	56	68	82	55	72	72	405
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	11	6	37	6	6	2	6	17	98

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	7	9	4	38	41	22	46	48	50	265

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	11	6	37	6	6	2	6	17	98
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	2	2	3	4	7	21

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	1	3	4	5	3	7	8	9	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	2	1	9
Course failure in ELA	7	11	6	49	22	22	6	44	3	170
Course failure in Math	7	9	4	33	38	22	39	35	76	263
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	55	62	59	50	72	75	373
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	56	68	82	55	72	72	405
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	11	6	37	6	6	2	6	17	98

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	7	9	4	38	41	22	46	48	50	265

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	11	6	37	6	6	2	6	17	98
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	2	2	3	4	7	21

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*	38	61	53	42	62	55	47		
ELA Learning Gains				46			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			33		
Math Achievement*	45	63	55	45	51	42	35		
Math Learning Gains				59			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			21		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	39	56	52	33	60	54	33		
Social Studies Achievement*	56	77	68	61	68	59	54		
Middle School Acceleration	66	75	70	63	61	51	45		
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	55	62	55	55	75	70	60		

* 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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	502
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	22	Yes	4	2
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	50			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	50			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	46			

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	31	Yes	3	1
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	50			
BLK	46			
HSP	50			
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	49			

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	38			45			39	56	66			55
SWD	12			16			22	23			6	41
ELL	29			41			32	34	60		7	55
AMI												
ASN	50			50							2	
BLK	32			37			37	66			5	
HSP	40			47			39	53	67		7	56
MUL	50			67							2	
PAC												
WHT	40			60			48				3	
FRL	36			43			35	52	57		7	53

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	42	46	45	45	59	53	33	61	63			55
SWD	15	37	36	19	45	42	16	33				39
ELL	35	46	46	39	57	51	16	53	67			55
AMI												
ASN	33			67								
BLK	37	43	38	37	58	55	26	67	50			
HSP	43	47	47	46	59	52	33	59	61			54
MUL	29	17		50	83							
PAC												
WHT	52	53		60	64	60	63	79	92			
FRL	40	45	45	43	58	52	31	59	61			56

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	47	42	33	35	22	21	33	54	45			60
SWD	15	32	28	13	16	18	20	32				53
ELL	36	46	38	25	23	30	24	41	29			60

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
AMI												
ASN	64			18								
BLK	43	36	21	30	22	13	25	42	35			
HSP	47	43	37	36	22	23	34	55	42			60
MUL	38	21		27	7							
PAC												
WHT	68	56	10	59	31	20	48	85	80			
FRL	45	41	31	33	21	22	32	52	42			60

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	42%	56%	-14%	54%	-12%
07	2023 - Spring	33%	50%	-17%	47%	-14%
08	2023 - Spring	34%	51%	-17%	47%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	40%	58%	-18%	58%	-18%
06	2023 - Spring	36%	50%	-14%	47%	-11%
03	2023 - Spring	40%	52%	-12%	50%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	49%	58%	-9%	54%	-5%
07	2023 - Spring	47%	48%	-1%	48%	-1%
03	2023 - Spring	53%	63%	-10%	59%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	64%	-8%	61%	-5%
08	2023 - Spring	30%	59%	-29%	55%	-25%
05	2023 - Spring	41%	58%	-17%	55%	-14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	29%	40%	-11%	44%	-15%
05	2023 - Spring	42%	50%	-8%	51%	-9%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	56%	19%	50%	25%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	52%	38%	48%	42%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	65%	18%	63%	20%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	54%	68%	-14%	66%	-12%

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.

Based off progress monitoring and 2022-23 state assessments, the data components that showed lowest performance is in 5th and 8th grade Science. 5th - 42% and 8th 29%.

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

The component showed the greatest decline was in Civics. In 2022- 61 % to 2023- 54%. The contributing factors to this decline in Social Science were a lack of focus in backwards planning,

academic vocabulary, analyzing data to differentiate instruction, and supporting teachers in integrating the curriculum for our Civics course.

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 compared to the state average was ELA throughout all grade levels. The contributing factors to this need for improvement were:

- Lack of certified teachers in our ELA classes
- Supporting teachers with the ELA curriculum
- Implementing small group instruction with fidelity
- Providing teachers with ongoing professional development on ELA curriculum and ensuring that they receive their resources in a timely manner.

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

Based off the 2023 state assessments, the data components that showed the most improvement were in Mathematics, which we had an increase in 3rd, 4th, 5th and 7th grade. We will continue to focus on our Success Block which concentrated on analyzing data to create small group instruction and provide students with differentiation in Mathematics.

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

Attendance and multiple factors impacting student achievement

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

- Highest Ranking:
- Implement Ed Model with fidelity
 - Coaching Cycle
 - Data Chats, Monitoring, Tracking
 - Small Group/DI
 - Culture/AVID

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

The area of focus is to create a positive culture and environment is to improve the stakeholder wellness through activities, athletics and arts. We will also create a staff wellness event per quarter using the Wellness Survey Data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on the Wellness survey results, we will implement a staff wellness event per quarter.

Monitoring:

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

- Establish Culture Champion
- Plan 1 staff activity per quarter
- Expand school-based committees
- AiA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Corinne Baez (921387@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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The areas of focus are to Improve College & Career Readiness Opportunites for all students and increase MS Acceleration to 80%.

Person Responsible: Corinne Baez (921387@dadeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

#2. 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 our data review, our school will focus on Instructional Practice/Support Facilitation, related to student IEP goals, leading to increased learning gains. This was selected because students with disabilities are not making adequate academic progress through learning gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The subgroup Students With Disabilities (SWD) will increase learning gains by 3 points by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through weekly classroom walk throughs (teacher effectiveness), NWEA data 2 times per year and FAST/STAR progress monitoring 2 times per year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Corinne Baez (921387@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.)

WICOR (Writing Inquiry Collaboration Organization Reading) will be used one strategy introduced each month to increase student achievement. This are part of the AVID system we are implementing for the first time this year. We will also be implementing the Marzano High Yield instructional strategy of higher order questioning and collaboration through think pair share.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The specific learning strategies noted are being used to increase academic rigor and student achievement. The goal is to promote learning gains and proficiency across grade levels and within the SWD subgroup.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

School improvement areas and funding allocations are reviewed throughout the year, starting in July with our Strategic Planning sessions. Data is reviewed and analyzed to identify areas needing improvement and aligning those areas with what materials and resources are needed to support. The strategic plan will then guide our school initiatives and our School Improvement Plan. We determine resources for each tier of instruction for core content areas. We allocate resources through Title I funding as well. The needs of the school based on data determines our school improvement plan initiatives and allocations for funding those key areas.

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

Our area of focus for Reading/ELA will be focusing on implementing an effective RTI program, implementing small group and differentiation during ELA block, and providing teachers with professional development on instructional strategies, curriculum, and the BEST standards. This will affect student literacy as it will help close the learning gap and provide teachers with the tools needed to teach reading effectively. In addition, these instructional practices were selected based on the 2022-2023 SAT and NWEA results where 69% of second graders were at or above average in Reading and 64% were at or above average in Mathematics.

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

Our area of focus for Reading/ELA will be focusing on implementing an effective RTI program, honing in on small group and differentiation during ELA block, and providing teachers with professional development on instructional strategies, curriculum, and BEST standards. This will affect student literacy as it will help close the learning gap and provide teachers with the tools needed to teach reading effectively. These instructional practices were selected based on the 2022-23 FSA Results and

NWEA data.

Grade 3 FSA ELA Proficiency: 41%

Grade 4 FSA ELA Proficiency: 40%

Grade 5 FSA ELA Proficiency: 42%

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

Grades K-2 data will increase to 70 % students reading at or above grade level.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Grades 3-5 data will increase by 4 percentage points per grade level.

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.

- Small Group instruction will occur daily from the general education teacher.
- RTI groups will be pulled on a weekly basis by the RTI teacher. Data will be analyzed and drive grouping on a quarterly basis.
- Professional development on instructional strategies will occur on a quarterly basis.
- Professional development on curriculum and BEST standards will occur on a biweekly basis

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Baez, Corinne, 921387@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?

Data from the following programs:

- iReady
- NWEA
- SAT/ FSA
- MyView
- Lexia

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?

The evidence based programs address the identified needs and are aligned to our reading plan and the BEST ELA standards.

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
<p>1. Implement effective RTI program by meeting on a quarterly basis to review student data and action plan for RTI groups.</p> <p>2. Small Group Instruction/ Differentiation by holding biweekly collaborative planning and focusing on student data to drive instruction in literacy and reading comprehension.</p> <p>3. Ongoing professional development for instructional strategies and BEST ELA standards where teachers will learn how to dissect standard(s) and the content limits.</p>	<p>Baez, Corinne, 921387@dadeschools.net</p>

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 builds a positive relationships with parents, families, and stakeholders by having an open door policy, encouraging parents to learn about their child's success through parent informational PD sessions, and a Parent & Family Engagement Plan through Title I.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school’s mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child’s progress.
 List the school’s webpage* where the school’s Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school is encouraging parental involvement and training by holding "Parent University" sessions at least once a month. The sessions will teach parents how to support their child academically, emotionally and other areas.

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 strength academic programs through a focus on teacher effectiveness and the science of reading instruction. The school has identified students to participate in 4th grade accelerated math and 7th grade accelerated math courses in addition to Algebra 1.

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))

The plan is developed in alignment with our CSUSA Strategic Plan and SIP in addition to Title I.

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))

The school contracts with Invo Progressus to provide mental health services and contracted counseling as needed to Tier 1-3 students.

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))

The school is preparing students for post secondary opportunities through AVID strategies and an emphasis on college and career readiness.

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

The school wide model for tiered prevention and problem behaviors includes HERO positive behavior incentives, teacher professional development, Do The Right Thing program, Knights of Excellence monthly recognitions and rewards. The school will implement behavior interventionists to support daily check-ins and weekly progress reports. The school also has a minimum of one monthly meeting to address at risk students and behaviors.

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))

Teachers will participate in PLCs that focus on student data and growth. Teachers will participate in AVID strategies professional development, Cambridge professional development and the Science of Reading in K-2nd grade.

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

The school employs behavior interventionists, deans and RTI to assist young learners with transition to elementary school.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$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.

Yes