

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

North Twin Lakes 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

North Twin Lakes Elementary School

625 W 74TH PL, Hialeah, FL 33014

<http://ntle.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 North Twin Lakes Elementary School is to produce world-class learners by building a network of learning communities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of North Twin Lakes Elementary School is to guarantee that all students attain a solid foundation of knowledge and skills needed to succeed in secondary education and to compete in the global economy.

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
Fernandez, Jose R.	Principal	Develop standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities.
Atlas, Daniel	Assistant Principal	Assist with school management, student activities and services, community relations, personnel, and curriculum instruction. Coordinate with principals and board members to assist in defining and enforcing school policies and guidelines for students, staff, and faculty.
Gonzalez, Maria	Teacher, K-12	Work in collaboration with principals and other school administrators by facilitating improvements in instruction and promoting practices among their peers that can lead to improved student learning outcomes.
Horta, Jalitze	Teacher, K-12	Work in collaboration with principals and other school administrators by facilitating improvements in instruction and promoting practices among their peers that can lead to improved student learning outcomes.
Alvarez, Jeanette	Teacher, K-12	Work in collaboration with principals and other school administrators by facilitating improvements in instruction and promoting practices among their peers that can lead to improved student learning outcomes.
Berrios, Stefanie	Assistant Principal	Assist with school management, student activities and services, community relations, personnel, and curriculum instruction. Coordinate with principals and board members to assist in defining and enforcing school policies and guidelines for students, staff, and faculty.
Gonzalez, Lilly-Ann	Instructional Coach	Work in collaboration with principals and other school administrators by facilitating improvements in instruction and promoting practices among their peers that can lead to improved student learning outcomes.

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.

All stakeholders are involved in the School Improvement process during our faculty and EESAC meeting. The implementation step and the effectiveness is discussed with all stakeholders to ensure student achievement. The School Improvement Process is also discussed at grade level meetings where they discuss and develop action steps to assist with student achievement.

SIP Monitoring

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

Classroom walkthroughs, students progress monitoring and common planning agendas will be used in order to monitor the SIP outcomes. The school leadership team will meet monthly in order to share and discuss outcomes. Based on the action steps of the SIP, the leadership team will make adjustments if necessary.

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	N/A
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: 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	17	11	11	10	3	5	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	3	32	26	9	3	0	0	0	73
Course failure in Math	0	5	12	24	17	5	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	26	22	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	26	17	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	26	23	36	41	33	29	0	0	0	188

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	13	37	25	15	0	0	0	93

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	11	13	16	16	4	8	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	5	36	11	5	0	0	0	57
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	10	12	13	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	6	13	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	9	13	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	4	14	13	14	0	0	0	45

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	4	14	13	14	0	0	0	45

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	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	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	11	13	16	16	4	8	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	5	36	11	5	0	0	0	57
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	10	12	13	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	6	13	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	9	13	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	4	14	13	14	0	0	0	45

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	4	14	13	14	0	0	0	45

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	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	51	60	53	59	62	56	55		
ELA Learning Gains				77			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				68			41		
Math Achievement*	61	66	59	58	58	50	51		
Math Learning Gains				62			51		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			28		
Science Achievement*	49	58	54	36	64	59	42		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	72	63	59	63			55		

* 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)	N/A
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	286
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	480
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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	58			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	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%
SWD	49			
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	60			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	59			

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	51			61			49					72
SWD	23			35							4	65
ELL	47			56			43				5	72
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	52			62			49				5	72
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	52			60			52				5	76

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	59	77	68	58	62	57	36					63
SWD	32	66	61	42	50	64	17					62
ELL	55	74	65	55	55	52	31					63
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												
HSP	62	76	65	60	61	54	38					63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	58	75	68	55	59	59	35					61

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	51	41	51	51	28	42					55
SWD	29	39		31	33		27					50
ELL	45	49	40	44	42	13	29					55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	55	51	41	51	51	28	42					55
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	54	53	44	48	50	29	45					54

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	51%	56%	-5%	54%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	41%	58%	-17%	58%	-17%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	45%	52%	-7%	50%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	65%	63%	2%	59%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	64%	-15%	61%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	58%	-5%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	41%	50%	-9%	51%	-10%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

According to Power BI data, 3rd grade ELA showed the lowest performance. In 2022-23 school year 45% of 3rd grade students showed proficiency, compared to 54% in 2021-22. This decline of 9 percentage points can be attributed to several factors. The implementation of the new B.E.S.T standards, as well as the new computer based F.A.S.T. assessment contributed to the change in student performance.

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

According to Power BI data, 4th grade ELA showed the greatest decline. In 2022-23 school year 41% of 4th grade students showed proficiency, compared to 60% in 2021-22. This decline of 19 percentage points can be attributed to several factors. The implementation of the new B.E.S.T standards, as well as the new computer based F.A.S.T. assessment contributed to the change in student performance.

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.

According to Power BI data, 4th grade ELA was the component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average. In the 2022-23 school year 41% of 4th grade students showed proficiency, compared to the state average of 60%. This decline of 19 percentage points can be attributed to several factors.

The implementation of the new B.E.S.T standards, as well as the new computer based F.A.S.T. assessment contributed to the change in student performance.

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

According to Power BI data, 5th grade science showed the most improvement. In 2022-23 school year 41% of 5th grade students showed proficiency, compared to 35% in 2021-22. This increase of 6 percentage points can be attributed to several factors. The action steps in the previous school improvement plan such as a Science Liaison, Data Driven Instruction, STEM days, and collaborative planning all contributed to the improvement in this area.

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

According to Power BI data, one area of concern is the amount of students in 3rd grade who have failure in ELA and in Math.

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

According to Power BI data, the highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year are continuing to improve ELA and Science scores, as well as maintaining mathematics proficiency.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to Power BI data on the 2022-23 FAST PM3, 24% of students with disabilities were proficient in ELA. Compared to 2021-22, which 2% of SWD were proficient. This is an increase of 22 percentage points. In 2022-23, 38% of English language learners were proficient in ELA. Compared to 5% in 2021-22, an increase of 33 percentage points. We will implement the Targeted Element of Data Driven Instruction in order to improve proficiency by 5 percentage points.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on the data and identified contributing factors of high number of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students, we will implement the Targeted Element of Data Driven ELA Instruction through progress monitoring assessments in order to improve proficiency by 5 percentage points on the F.A.S.T Assessment PM3.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through monitoring logs that the teachers will be inputting their student data for the administration to track student progress, as well as through Power BI and other tracking platforms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jose R. Fernandez (pr3981@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Data-Driven Instruction is an educational approach that relies on the teacher's use of student performance data to inform instructional planning and delivery. This systematic approach of instruction uses assessment, analysis, and actions to meet student's needs. Data-Driven Instruction may include developing Instructional Focus Calendars (IFC) to inform teachers on specific standards to target during instruction throughout the year, based on data outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The strategy that will be used is data driven instruction. This strategy will allow teachers to make informed instructional decisions, optimize resources, and adapt their teaching practices to better meet the diverse needs of their students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

8/14-9/29 Provide professional development for all instructional personnel on strategies and tools for data driven instruction. Teachers will be coached on standards aligned methods to assess student proficiency.

Person Responsible: Stefanie Berrios (246382@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

8/14-9/29 Provide a refresher training to instructional personnel on how to use Power BI and other data tracking platforms to analyze student data. Teachers will use this information to provide data driven instruction and complete data chats with students.

Person Responsible: Stefanie Berrios (246382@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

8/14-9/29 Teachers will be given a growth monitoring log to track student progress through assessments, STAR/F.A.S.T. results, and iReady diagnostic results. Through the use of this log, data driven instructional group will be implemented.

Person Responsible: Stefanie Berrios (246382@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

According the 2022-23 School Improvement Plan survey 53% of teachers collaborated weekly. A increase of 22% from 2021-22 school year. Although this number is an increase, this is still an area of concern. In order to increase student achievement and performance staff will meet to collaboratively plan using district pacing guides, teacher handbooks, and utilizing Florida's best standards English language arts guide.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our teachers will meet and collaboratively plan to improve student outcomes. In order to improve our student outcomes weekly collaborative planning will increase by 10% as evidenced by the SIP survey.

Monitoring:

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

After meeting weekly, teachers will share agendas and sign in sheets with the administrative. Administration will be invited to join the teams as whenever they wish. Administration will make sure that the collaborative planning meetings are taking place in order.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jose R. Fernandez (pr3981@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.)

Making Meetings Matter involves ensuring the time is managed properly and used effectively. The purpose is to guarantee that meetings are effective (the time should be used for the exchange of information, problem solving, and reviewing progress).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Making Meetings Matter promotes efficient, meaningful, and collaborative meetings. By implementing the strategies and principles of this intervention, teachers can make better use of their time, improve communication, and ultimately contribute to collaborative educational outcomes.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

8/14-9/29 Schedules will be created to include collaborative planning across all grade levels.

Person Responsible: Jose R. Fernandez (pr3981@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

8/14-9/29. Teachers will meet weekly to collaboratively plan throughout all grade levels and express needs and concerns to administration.

Person Responsible: Jose R. Fernandez (pr3981@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

8/14-9/29 Teachers will share agendas and sign in sheets from collaborative meetings to administrative team.

Person Responsible: Jose R. Fernandez (pr3981@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

8/14-9/29 Schedules will be created to include collaborative planning across all grade levels.

Person Responsible: Jose R. Fernandez (pr3981@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

8/14-9/29. Teachers will meet weekly to collaboratively plan throughout all grade levels and express needs and concerns to administration.

Person Responsible: Jose R. Fernandez (pr3981@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

8/14-9/29 Teachers will share agendas and sign in sheets from collaborative meetings to administrative team.

Person Responsible: Jose R. Fernandez (pr3981@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2023 Power BI assessment data, 53% of fifth grade students were proficient in math, an increase of 8 percentage points from the 2022 year. Although there was an increase of 8 percentage points, this still remains an area of concern. While differentiated instruction has been proved to be effective in improving growth, we will focus on DI to address this critical need.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of DI math students will demonstrate a 5 percent point increase in math proficiency as measured by student performance on the F.A.S.T Assessment PM3.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team will conduct a walkthrough in August to ensure DI centers are established, appropriate materials are evident and based on individual student needs, data binders are current, and transitions to DI centers are conducted in a clear and consist manner. Admin will begin bi weekly walkthroughs in September after FAST PM 1 to ensure instruction/assessments are adjusted and based on individual student needs and DI centers are running efficiently and effectively. Feedback will be provided immediately following walkthroughs to assist and support teachers as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jose R. Fernandez (pr3981@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiated instruction improves math scores by tailoring instruction to individual students' needs, learning styles, and abilities. It fosters engagement, confidence, and a deeper understanding of math concepts, ultimately leading to improved performance in mathematics. Student performance data is analyzed and used to provide differentiated instruction incorporating a variety of learning strategies to engage students in active participation.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

8/14-9/29. Teachers will develop lesson plans that are inclusive of DI instruction. As a result, teachers will have student groups, appropriate resources, and lesson plans that reflect DI instruction in mathematics. Admin Team will begin bi-weekly walkthroughs in September after FAST PM assessment to ensure DI centers have appropriate materials and are based on needs of individual students.

Person Responsible: Jose R. Fernandez (pr3981@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

8/14-9/29 Administrators will check Power BI platform bi-weekly to monitor student outcome on topic assessments.

Person Responsible: Jose R. Fernandez (pr3981@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

8/14-9/29 Administrators will conduct bi-weekly walkthroughs to ensure differentiated instruction is occurring based on the data.

Person Responsible: Jose R. Fernandez (pr3981@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

#4. 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 2023 Science proficiency data, 52% of students are proficient in Science. In 2022, 32% of students were proficient in Science. Science proficiency increased 20 percentage points, however it is still a concern. While data driven instruction has been proven to be effective in improving proficiency rates in elementary grades, we will focus on data driven instruction to address the critical need and increase science proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of data driven instruction we can increase grade 5 science proficiency by a minimum of 5 percentage points as evidenced by the 2024 State Assessments.

Monitoring:

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

The Admin Team will ensure reliable baseline data is obtained during science pre tests and 5th grade science baseline in August - September. This data will be used to provide data driven science instruction based on lowest performance standards. During bi-weekly walkthroughs, the Admin Team will look for evidence of collaborative planning with a focus on data driven instruction, lesson plans, evidence of quarterly science benchmark assessments and evidence of groups being adjusted based on various data points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jose R. Fernandez (pr3981@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Data-Driven Instruction is an educational approach that relies on the teacher's use of student performance data to inform instructional planning and delivery. This systematic approach of instruction uses assessment, analysis, and actions to meet student's needs. Data-Driven Instruction may include developing Instructional Focus Calendars (IFC) to inform teachers on specific standards to target during instruction throughout the year, based on data outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data-Driven Instruction will ensure that teachers are using accurate data to plan lessons that meet the student needs. Teachers will make ongoing adjustments to their plans and instructional delivery as new data is populated.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

8/14-9/29 8/22-10/14. The 5th Grade Science Team will provide a best practice session on building capacity of science content to new teachers in grades K - 4. The science liaison will attend science related workshops and disseminate information to science teachers.

Person Responsible: Jose R. Fernandez (pr3981@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

8/14-9/29 Teachers will collaborate weekly to develop lesson plans using the district's science pacing guide. Teachers will disaggregate data to target specific skills for remediation.

Person Responsible: Jose R. Fernandez (pr3981@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

Administrators will facilitate monthly collaborative planning meetings to provide teachers with an opportunity to collaborate and brainstorm challenges, needs, and shared best practices. The Admin Team will review data binders during the monthly collaboration meeting to provide targeted feedback.

Person Responsible: Jose R. Fernandez (pr3981@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29

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

According to 2022-23, STAR assessment data 81% of students in Kindergarten scored below the 50th percentile in ELA. While students in 2nd grade had 80% scoring below the 50th percentile. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of high number of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students, and a different style of assessment we will implement the Targeted Element of Checks for Understanding.

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

According to 2022-23, F.A.S.T assessment data 55% of students in 3rd grade scored below Level 3 in ELA. While students in 4th grade had 59% scoring below Level 3. Based on the data and the identified

contributing factors of high number of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students, and a different style of assessment we will implement the Targeted Element of Checks for Understanding.

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

With the implementation of checks for understanding, K students below the 40th percentile on the STAR ELA assessment will decrease to 49% by PM3 for the 2023-24 school year. Students in 2nd grade below the 40th percentile on the STAR ELA assessment will decrease to 49% by PM3 for the 2023-24 school year.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

With the implementation of checks for understanding, 3rd grades students proficient on the F.A.S.T. ELA assessment will increase to 54% by PM3 for the 2023-24 school year. Students in 4th grade with proficiency on the F.A.S.T. ELA will increase to 50% by PM3 for the 2023-24 school year.

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.

This area of focus will be monitored through Power BI and other tracking platforms.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Berrios, Stefanie, saberrios@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?

Checking for Understanding is an important step in the teaching and learning process. The background knowledge that students bring into the classroom influences how they understand the material shared and the lessons or learning opportunities provided. In fact, Checking for Understanding is part of a formative assessment system in which teachers identify learning goals, provide students feedback, and then plan instruction based on students' errors and misconceptions.

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?

According to 2022-23, STAR assessment data 81% of students in Kindergarten scored below the 50th percentile in ELA. While students in 2nd grade had 59% scoring below the 50th percentile. According to 2022-23, F.A.S.T assessment data 55% of students in 3rd grade scored below Level 3 in ELA. While students in 4th grade had 59% scoring below Level 3. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of high number of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students, and a different style of assessment we will implement the Targeted Element of Checks for Understanding.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
8/14-9/29 Provide professional development for all instructional personnel on strategies and tools to use in order to check for understanding. Teachers will be coached on standards aligned methods to assess student proficiency.	Berrios, Stefanie, saberrios@dadeschools.net
8/14-9/29 Provide a refresher training to instructional personnel on how to use Power BI and other data tracking platforms to analyze student data. Teachers will use this information to provide data driven instruction and complete data chats with students.	Berrios, Stefanie, saberrios@dadeschools.net
8/14-9/29 Administrators will conduct data chats with instructional personnel in order to analyze students' current mastery on targeted ELA benchmarks in order to improve proficiency in the upcoming school year.	Berrios, Stefanie, saberrios@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.

North Twin Lakes Elementary disseminates the SIP to stakeholders through open house, EESAC meetings, and faculty meetings. We also have a copy in our EESAC binder as needed. The SIP team meets over the summer to analyze data and identify areas of concern.

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 plan to build a positive relationship with all stakeholders through various forms of communication. EESAC meetings, family nights provided through community schools, and Title 1 meetings. In addition, all stakeholders are informed of school wide activities through ClassDojo, school calendar, social media platforms.

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)

To strengthen the academic programs at our school, we will provide extended learning opportunities for the students before and after school. The students will also receive intervention to strengthen areas of concern.

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))

The counselors are a part of the school leadership team to assure all aspects of the student is addressed. The mental health specialist works closely with the administration and counselor to provide the services the students need.

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))

At North Twin Lakes we prepare students by having them participated in Feeder Pattern Nights. This provides an opportunity for students and families to see what neighboring middle schools have to offer as their child transitions to postsecondary schooling. We also provide in house visits from neighboring middle schools that provide the students with information about the school. Middle schools and High schools are also invited to participate during school functions. At North Twin Lakes, we have Guest Speaker Day, this provides students with an opportunity to learn about different workforce, their job, and the education and skills that are required for success in their career.

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).

At North Twin Lakes Elementary, failing grade meetings are held with the assistant principal and teachers to discuss the steps or intervention needed to proceed and assist students who are displaying academic or behavioral concerns. We initiate the process by identified students who are showing academic or behavior concerns by completing the Request for Assistance packet once interventions are not effective. Once the Request for Assistance is completed, the SST team comes together to develop strategies and a plan to assist the student.

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))

North Twin Lakes has a PLST Team that consist of an AP, a New Teacher Leader, an Instructional Coach, a Digital Innovator and a PD Liaison. As a team, we all collaborate, provide support and promote a school culture of professional learning. The PLST New Teacher Mentor is there to provide support to the new teachers entering the workplace. She is available to answer any questions and provide guidance during the school year.

This year we have a new buddy system in place. This system provides additional support to new

teachers by assigning a buddy to them in the same grade level. Together they work on best practices and collaborate on student achievement.

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 provides a field trip to Kindergarten classes where students experience a day in the life of a Kindergarten student. A pre-K to Kindergarten parent meeting is held to inform parents about the school and the expectations as their child transitions from early childhood to kindergarten.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$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