

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Norland 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Norland Elementary School

19340 NW 8TH CT, Miami, FL 33169

norlandbears.com

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.

We, the staff and community of Norland Elementary School, believe that all students can become life long learners and participatory citizens in a global society. Our mission is to provide students with a variety of valuable learning experiences and the tools necessary to succeed, in order for them to develop the skills necessary to become independent critical thinkers and life long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Norland Elementary School, we strive to implement structure, encourage teamwork, build relationships, with a focus on organization, nurturing and goal-setting.

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
Spence, Crystal	Principal	Provide leadership and developing school-wide efforts; Encourage positive school culture.
Smith, Elisa	Assistant Principal	Under the leadership of the principal, serve as an educational leader and assist the principal in planning and directing academic programs.
Chandon, Maria	School Counselor	Provide individual counseling and guidance lessons to help students effectively cope with personal, social, academic needs. Consult with stakeholders regarding the needs and abilities of students.
Collins, Nekeya	Reading Coach	Coach will provide direct services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction.
Perry, Ericka	Teacher, K-12	Provide direct services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction in primary grades.
Stewart, Denise	Teacher, K-12	Provide direct services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction in intermediate grades.
Javier, Estephany	Other	Provide direct services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction for ELL students and school-wide media.

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 SIP, as the primary artifact is shared with stakeholders during EESAC meetings, faculty meetings, and is made available to parents to the website and a hard copy is available in the Community Involvement Specialist's office.

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 plan is reviewed monthly with faculty and staff, during EESAC meetings and updated as needed.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	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	99%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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: 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	29	28	19	10	8	0	0	0	94	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	10	20	19	7	0	0	0	56	
Course failure in Math	0	0	11	11	9	8	0	0	0	39	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	28	14	0	0	0	68	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	28	24	0	0	0	66	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	19	32	49	35	16	0	0	0	151	

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	12	4	53	20	37	0	0	0	126

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	26	1	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

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	24	9	16	19	16	18	0	0	0	102	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	23	12	24	9	9	0	0	0	77	
Course failure in Math	0	9	1	16	9	7	0	0	0	42	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	38	30	46	0	0	0	114	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	41	46	0	0	0	119	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	24	22	46	31	60	0	0	0	183	

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	10	4	40	30	38	0	0	0	122

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	1	28	0	1	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	28	27	13	14	10	11	0	0	0	103	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	11	6	31	10	8	0	0	0	66	
Course failure in Math	0	12	4	14	12	11	0	0	0	53	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	53	17	37	0	0	0	107	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	41	29	51	0	0	0	121	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	19	31	26	61	20	45	0	0	0	202	

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	10	4	40	30	38	0	0	0	122

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	1	28	0	1	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	46	60	53	41	62	56	35		
ELA Learning Gains				54			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			55		
Math Achievement*	44	66	59	43	58	50	25		
Math Learning Gains				60			18		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			15		
Science Achievement*	26	58	54	26	64	59	20		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	63	63	59	55			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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	218
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	368
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	19	Yes	3	3
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	27	Yes	1	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	41			

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	26	Yes	2	2
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	44			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	45			

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	46			44			26					63
SWD	13			26			13				4	
ELL	29			67							4	63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48			44			27				5	75
HSP	19			38							4	40
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	43			41			23				5	62

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	41	54	38	43	60	51	26					55
SWD	12	21	22	21	47	31	0					53
ELL	32	56		50	56		27					55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	53	38	42	60	51	24					56
HSP	37			39								55
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	39	52	37	42	61	51	26					53

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	35	51	55	25	18	15	20					37
SWD	7	68	70	18	21		15					25
ELL	18	36		27	29		8					37
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	52	55	23	19	13	18					37
HSP	27	45		24	9		36					50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	34	50	53	24	17	13	19					37

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	45%	56%	-11%	54%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	54%	58%	-4%	58%	-4%
03	2023 - Spring	32%	52%	-20%	50%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	44%	63%	-19%	59%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	64%	-18%	61%	-15%
05	2023 - Spring	31%	58%	-27%	55%	-24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	24%	50%	-26%	51%	-27%

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.

Science showed the lowest performance at 25%. One of the contributing factors is the lack of follow-up after conducting a lab, such as giving sample questions that dealt with it. Another contributing factor was teachers not planning consistently for instruction.

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

Science showed the greatest decline from 28% to 25%. One of the contributing factors is the lack of follow-up after conducting a lab, such as giving sample questions that dealt with it. Another contributing factor was teachers not planning consistently for instruction.

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.

Science had the greatest gap when compared to the state's average of 50%. One of the contributing factors is the lack of follow-up after conducting a lab, such as giving sample questions that dealt with it. Another contributing factor was teachers not planning consistently for instruction.

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

Reading showed the most improvement from 40% to 47%. Teachers met weekly for collaborative planning, in addition to district support providing support to teachers and coach. In addition, we have a school-wide plan to improve reading by having vocabulary challenge weekly.

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

Grade 3 in ELA is a potential concern (35% proficiency). Attendance could possibly be a potential area of concern also.

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

Math and Science are our greatest priorities for school improvement next year.

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 Collaborative Planning**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 PM3 data, 44% of 3rd-5th grade students were proficient and of that 22% were proficient in the subgroup of Students with Disabilities (SWD) in Mathematics. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: overall 44% proficiency on FAST Mathematics from 3rd-5th Grade. The absence of an instructional mathematics coach hindered teachers' ability to build capacity, efficacy and effectiveness in delivering standard-aligned instruction, we will implement Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM).

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 Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM), there will be a 10% increase in 3rd-5th grade mathematics and an increase of 5% for the SWD subgroup in proficiency on the 2023-2024 FAST PM3 Mathematics Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through walkthroughs, data chats, and collaborative planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elisa Smith (epsmith@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 Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model (GRRM) is a particular style of teaching which is a structured method of pedagogy framed around a process beginning with explicit instruction. Students are guided through the learning process with clear statements about the purpose and rationale for learning the new skill. The GRRM is distinguished by four phases: (I do) clear explanations and demonstrations of the instructional target, (We do) providing strategic guided practice and feedback, (They do) gradually releasing students to practice the new skill collaboratively, and (You do) eventually requiring students to demonstrate mastery of the learning target independently.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM) will build teacher confidence and efficacy when delivering instruction that is standard-aligned. Through collaborative planning, teachers will be able to practice and develop in the implementation of the four phases of the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM).

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.

8/15- A Professional Development on the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM) will be delivered. As a result of this professional development, teachers will have a roadmap to effectively plan instruction that is targeted and structured.

Person Responsible: Nekeya Collins (ncollins@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 15, 2023

8/15-9/14- By engaging in collaborative planning, all teachers will effectively use the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM) to plan instruction that is effective and targeted. This practice will result in an increase in teacher capacity and confidence to deliver effective instruction.

Person Responsible: Elisa Smith (epsmith@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 14, 2023

8/15-9/26- The administrative team will conduct walkthroughs to determine the effectiveness of the instructional delivery using the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM). As a result of the walkthroughs, the leadership team will determine strengths and areas for growth to identify next steps in building capacity.

Person Responsible: Elisa Smith (epsmith@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2022-2023 Florida Statewide Science Assessment, 25% of 5th Grade students overall and 11% from the SWD subgroup were proficient in Science. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: science was not taught with fidelity in grades K-4 which resulted in a lack of student background knowledge, we will implement Interactive Learning Environment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of an Interactive Learning Environment, 50% of students including the SWD subgroup will demonstrate proficiency on the 2023-2024 Florida Statewide Science Assessment by June 6th, 2023.

Monitoring:

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

The administrative team will conduct walkthroughs to look for evidence of Interactive Learning Environment. Evidence can include but is not limited to interactive notebooks, anchor charts, scaffolds, academic vocabulary, and use of instructional/metacognitive processes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elisa Smith (epsmith@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Since students lack background knowledge in the subject of Science, teachers will implement an Interactive Learning Environment with a focus on closing gaps through the use of prerequisite skills, academic vocabulary, and instructional/metacognitive processes.

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.

9/6- During the designated faculty meeting, the administrative team will share established collaborative planning days and expectation for science in order to foster a culture of collaboration by encouraging all science teachers to share best practices and resources, facilitating peer learning and support.

Person Responsible: Elisa Smith (epsmith@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 6, 2023

9/6-9/29- All science teachers will utilize the 5 E's Instructional Framework to develop and deliver interactive science lessons.

Person Responsible: Elisa Smith (epsmith@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

9/6-9/26- The administrative team will conduct monthly walkthroughs in order to evaluate science end products and determine the effectiveness of the Interactive Learning Environment evidence-based intervention.

Person Responsible: Crystal Spence (cspence@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

#3. 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.

According to the School Climate Survey from 2022-2023 school year, 48% of the staff was either neutral or disagreed with the statement that "the school building is kept clean and in good conditions." Based on the data and the identified contributing factor of building cleanliness, unsanitary conditions can have a negative impact on students health and school performance. As a result, we will implement the Consistent Protocols to Maintain a Clean and Welcoming School Environment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school will achieve a passing score of 90% or above on the school sanitation audit conducted by the School Plan Operation, ensuring compliance with all sanitation standards and protocols.

Monitoring:

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

The administrative team will use an established routine to evaluate the efficiency and efficacy of the Protocols to Maintain a Clean and Welcoming School Environment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Crystal Spence (cspence@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.)

Consistent Protocols to Maintain a Clean and Welcoming School Environment promote healthy and well maintained environments. Unsanitary conditions attract insects, vermin, irritants and allergens found in dust and dirt which can have a negative impact on student health and school performance. Consistent Protocols to Maintain a Clean and Welcoming School Environment requires a holistic approach. It requires school administrators and educators to join together to create a learning environment that takes into consideration the language, cultures, and family structures of their students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The intervention of Implementing Consistent Protocols to Maintain a Clean and Welcoming School Environment was chosen to ensure the health, safety, and comfort of students, staff, and visitors, promoting a conducive atmosphere for learning and fostering a sense of pride and ownership in the school community.

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.

8/15-9/29 We will implement branding initiatives throughout the school to enhance the school culture and create a more welcoming environment, including the development of a cohesive visual identity, promoting positive messaging and values, and incorporating branding elements across various communication channels and physical spaces within the school.

Person Responsible: Crystal Spence (cspence@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

8/15-9/29 We will organize a beautification day where students, staff, and community volunteers will come together to enhance the school's physical appearance by planting flowers, painting murals, and/or cleaning communal areas, fostering a positive and welcoming school environment that promotes a sense of pride and unity within the school community.

Person Responsible: Crystal Spence (cspence@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

8/15-9/29 We will establish a beautification committee composed of students, staff, and community members to actively monitor and enhance the improvement of school culture, spearheading initiatives to create a more inviting and welcoming school environment through aesthetic enhancements, landscaping projects, and collaborative efforts that foster a sense of pride and ownership among all stakeholders.

Person Responsible: Crystal Spence (cspence@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

#4. 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.

According to the 2022-2023 School Climate Survey, only 33% of the staff either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: I feel staff morale is high at my school. Based on the data and the identified contributing factor of low staff morale, we will implement the Celebrate Successes intervention.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Celebrate Successes, at least 52% of the staff will agree with the statement: "I feel staff morale is high at my school" by June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

The administrative team will develop a monthly calendar to plan achievement days and use an established routine to evaluate the impact of the Celebrate Successes Intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Crystal Spence (cspence@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.)

Celebrate Successes is when staff and student accomplishments are given special recognition and achievements are publicly celebrated allowing for encouragement from all stakeholders. Showing the connection between effort and achievement helps students to see the importance of effort and allows them to change their beliefs to emphasize it more. Recognition is more effective if it is contingent on achieving some specified standard.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The intervention Celebrate Successes fosters a positive and motivating learning environment. By publicly acknowledging and celebrating staff achievements, it reinforces the link between effort and accomplishment, inspiring staff to prioritize and invest in their professional endeavors. Moreover, by tying recognition to specified standards, it not only uplifts staff morale but also promotes a culture of continuous improvement within the educational institution.

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.

8/17-9/29- On a weekly basis, we will conduct a "Spotlight on Success" recognition program to honor and celebrate teachers who exhibit exemplary performance in their instructional duties and other aspects of their professional responsibilities.

Person Responsible: Estephany Javier (ejavier@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

8/17-9/29- We will implement a quarterly protocol for recognizing birthdays within faculty meetings and disseminating birthday announcements through morning announcements, thereby fostering an improved morale within our organization.

Person Responsible: Maria Chandon (mariachandon@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

8/17-9/29- During each faculty meeting, we will present the "Sailor Award" to honor and acknowledge teachers who exemplify exceptional leadership qualities and consistently exceed expectations.

Person Responsible: Elisa Smith (epsmith@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 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).

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

The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 2, based on 2022-2023 FAST Star assessment, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA FAST assessment is 43%. The Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM) was identified as an instructional practice to increase proficiency.

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

Overall proficiency was 46%. The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA assessment in grade 3, 63%, in grade 4, 45%, and in grade 5, 53%. The Gradual

Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM) was identified as an instructional practice to increase proficiency.

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

The measurable goal for English Language Arts (ELA) is 51% proficiency on the K-2 FAST Star Assessment for the 2023-2024 school year. The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 2, based on 2022-2023 FAST Star assessment, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA FAST assessment is 43%. The Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM) was identified as an instructional practice to increase proficiency.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The measurable goal for English Language Arts (ELA) is 51% proficiency on the Grade 3-5 FAST ELA Progress Monitoring Assessment for the 2023-2024 school year. Overall proficiency was 46%. The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA assessment in grade 3, 63%, in grade 4, 45%, and in grade 5, 53%. The Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM) was identified as an instructional practice to increase proficiency.

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.

The Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM) will be reviewed during collaborative planning and specific components of the instructional strategy will be aligned to the lessons. Instructional coaches will monitor implementation during classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Collins, Nekeya, ncollins@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?

The Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model (GRRM) is a particular style of teaching which is a structured method of pedagogy framed around a process beginning with explicit instruction. Students are guided through the learning process with clear statements about the purpose and rationale for learning the new skill. The GRRM is distinguished by four phases: (I do) clear explanations and demonstrations of the instructional target, (We do) providing strategic guided practice and feedback, (They do) gradually releasing students to practice the new skill collaboratively, and (You do) eventually requiring students to demonstrate mastery of the learning target independently.

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 team identified the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model to change the instructional focus from teacher-centered to student-centered. This will increase instructional delivery and engagement for all stakeholders.

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
8/15- A Professional Development on the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM) will be delivered. As a result of this professional development, teachers will have a roadmap to effectively plan instruction that is targeted and structured.	Collins, Nekeya, ncollins@dadeschools.net
8/15-9/29- By engaging in collaborative planning, teachers will effectively use the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM) to plan instruction that is effective and targeted. This practice will result in an increase in teacher capacity and confidence to deliver effective instruction.	Collins, Nekeya, ncollins@dadeschools.net
8/15-9/29- The administrative team will conduct walkthroughs to determine the effectiveness of the instructional delivery using the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM). As a result of the walkthroughs, the leadership team will determine strengths and areas for growth and identify next steps in building capacity.	Smith, Elisa, epsmith@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 SIP will be placed on the website, a hard copy in the community involvement specialist's office, discussed and copies made available during EESAC Meetings.

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's Family Engagement Plan will be available at norlandbears.com. The school will build positive relationship with parents, families and other community stakeholders through various activities, including but not limited to, Meet and Greet, Open House, Honor Roll ceremonies, PTA, EESAC meetings, Student of the Month, and District Town Hall meetings.

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 has hired interventionists, reading and math instructional coaches so teachers can execute collaborative planning. We have gifted classes that students are given accelerated curriculum.

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

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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).

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$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