

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Norwood 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	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

Norwood Elementary School

19810 NW 14TH CT, Miami, FL 33169

<http://norwood.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 Norwood Elementary School is to provide an environment which will prepare all students to be academically, socially, and physically successful in meeting the challenges of a multicultural society through technology, appropriate instructional strategies, self discipline, and parental and community support.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Norwood Elementary School is to create a learning climate where students, teachers, parents, community members and administrators feel welcome and confident. These stakeholders will be able to access and utilize technology to enhance teaching and learning which will result in improved academic achievement and narrowing of the achievement gap. Therefore, students will be prepared to compete in an ever-changing global society.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Barnett, LaTressia	Behavior Specialist	Assists and facilitates regular MTSS meetings, ensures attendance of team members and monitors the implementation of IEPs. Regularly meets with parents to schedule IEP meetings and reviews. Monitors FABS and BIPS for students and ensures implementation and monitoring of these plans.
Cartwright-Rind, Tracy	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal with monitoring instruction through daily classroom walk-throughs to ensure fidelity of the implementation on the New Best Standards. Meets with the leadership team and staff to analyzes and disaggregates data. Communicates with parents and staff about attendance and engages the community, as well as allocates resources as needed.
Daley , Crystal	Teacher, PreK	PreK teacher, ESSAC Chair, and responsible planning and coordinating activities for PreK. Assist with the writing of the SIP.
Williams, Kevin	Principal	The principal monitors instruction through daily classroom walk-throughs to ensure fidelity of the implementation on the New Best Standards. He meets with the leadership team and staff to analyzes and disaggregates data. He communicates with parents and staff about attendance and engages the community, as well as allocates resources as needed.

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.

In discussions and surveys, stakeholders were consulted. Their feedback was considered when creating the SIP and defining its objectives. The school leadership team evaluated and approved the SIP before implementation. The committee gathered up-to-date information on performance indicators for the school, including academic success, student conduct, attendance, teacher effectiveness, and community involvement.

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))

Based on the identified needs and priorities, the committee collaboratively sets specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) goals for improvement. The school will set up a system to collect relevant data regularly. This will include academic performance data. Regular checkpoints will be scheduled to assess progress towards established goals.

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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: 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	21	8	14	7	8	3	0	0	0	61	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	5	7	6	5	1	0	0	0	24	
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	5	5	1	0	0	0	14	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	8	16	0	0	0	28	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	7	15	0	0	0	24	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	11	23	19	30	25	20	0	0	0	128	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	1	0	1	9	5	15	0	0	0	31

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	13	12	4	7	5	0	0	0	41	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	2	8	5	6	7	0	0	0	28	
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	4	8	1	0	0	0	17	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	8	6	0	0	0	18	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	9	5	0	0	0	17	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	12	19	17	17	0	0	0	68	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	4	4	6	6	6	0	0	0	26

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	4	4	5	3	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	22	9	13	8	8	0	0	0	61	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	5	8	5	5	0	0	0	23	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	5	5	0	0	0	13	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	8	16	0	0	0	28	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	7	15	0	0	0	24	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	11	23	23	26	25	0	0	0	109	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	1	0	1	9	5	15	0	0	0	31

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	56	60	53	60	62	56	54		
ELA Learning Gains				65			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			33		
Math Achievement*	61	66	59	65	58	50	52		
Math Learning Gains				68			34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			33		
Science Achievement*	47	58	54	49	64	59	36		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		63	59						

** 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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	225
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	41			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	56			
HSP	70			
MUL				
PAC				

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%
WHT				
FRL	59			

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	48			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	58			
HSP	81			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	58			

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	56			61			47					
SWD	39			49			28				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53			61			47				4	
HSP	80			60							2	

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
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	56			59			59				4	

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	60	65	55	65	68	50	49					
SWD	53	59	40	47	53	43	39					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57	65	59	63	68	52	45					
HSP	85			77								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	60	64	50	65	68	50	48					

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	54	46	33	52	34	33	36					
SWD	40	29		42	18		29					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	54	48	38	51	35	36	36					
HSP	62			77								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												

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
FRL	54	48	38	52	35	36	35					

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	66%	56%	10%	54%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	58%	-10%	58%	-10%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	52%	4%	50%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	63%	63%	0%	59%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	60%	64%	-4%	61%	-1%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	58%	-5%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	50%	-5%	51%	-6%

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.

These are the lowest performance results school-wide:

Science with 55% of the tested population performing below proficiency. The contributing factor was the lack of exposure to content at lower grade levels with fidelity. This means that students were not prepared for the current curriculum challenges. In addition, the Science coach was needed in classrooms as substitute coverage due to nationwide teacher shortage. The lower grade levels were not consistently incorporating science labs during science lessons, therefore, hands on experiments were not being implemented on a continuous basis.

FAST PM 3 for Reading: 43% of the tested student population scored below proficiency. There was a trend of teachers monitoring the progress of their students' progress and reteaching deficient skills. However, alignment of Florida's BEST standards with the use of questions stems for ELA were not used with fidelity to master reading benchmarks and skills.

Math scores also showed a similar downward trend, with 41% of the assessed student population failing to reach proficiency on the FAST PM 3. There was also a trend of teachers monitoring the progress of their students and reteaching deficient skills. iReady PM 2 Reading: 51% school wide results indicate two to three grade levels below. In addition, iReady PM 2 Math 62% school wide indicates two to three grade levels below. The contributing factors were grade level planning and mini lesson implementation with support from the Reading and Math Coach due to all curriculum coaches being assigned to designated classrooms.

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

Based on last year's data from 2022 to 2023, declines were noticed in iReady Reading 48% school wide showing two to three academic levels below. The contributing factors were the implementation of the updated curriculum and lack of ongoing professional development for teachers and support staff. These results indicated that the updated curriculum was not adequately supported by professional development and resources. In addition, lack of support staff contributed to student performance decline.

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 the data points from the 2022-23 FAST and the 2022-2023 Statewide Science Assessment data, it became evident that we are facing a significant challenge in narrowing the gap between students' performance and the state averages. This is especially true in the area of reading and science. One prominent factor contributing to this gap is the substantial presence of students within the SWD subgroup. Unfortunately, a considerable proportion of these students experience ongoing academic difficulties in reading. This poses a substantial hurdle to achieving reading proficiency standards and keeping pace with the state average. Therefore, to ensure a well-rounded and equitable education for all students, addressing the specific needs of the fourth-grade SWD subgroup in reading and science is of paramount importance. By implementing targeted interventions and tailored support systems, we can bridge this gap and foster academic success for all students.

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

The iReady data component showed the most improvement. Actions such as the use of the Historical Data reports, the Diagnostic Growth Summary reports and the Personalized Instruction reports were used to develop DI groups. Additional interventionists, after school tutoring, and consistent student data chats were actions implemented. These actions have improved student performance and enabled teachers to target areas of need. The data is trended positively and the students grew academically.

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

Although the school overall average in Reading is above the state average 43.2 % of students in grades 3-5 are not proficient in the area of reading,

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

Provide Coaching Support for teachers and students
Instructional collaborative planning in alignment with FAST standards
Hands on reading, math and science labs and projects
Intervention push-in and pullout
Progress Monitoring

Area of Focus

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

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

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

According to the 2022 statewide science proficiency assessment data, 45% of students in grades three through five are proficient in science. Based on the data and identified contributing factors, we will implement experimental hands on learning to improve proficiency rates. These measures will be supported by collaborative planning with the help of the Science Coach.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of experimental hands on learning, science proficiency will increase by 5 percentage points in grades three, four, and five, as measured by student performance on FAST PM1 and FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

The administration will perform monthly walkthroughs during the science block. The leadership team will have quarterly data conversations to identify patterns, trends, and areas for improvement. Administrators will review lesson plans and essential lab documents bi-weekly to provide clues to student learning progress based on topic assessments and benchmark mastery. This data is analyzed at leadership team meetings to ensure that students are making progress on the corrected benchmarks. Those students who are not making progress on the OPMs are offered extended learning opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Williams (pr4001@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.)

Hands-on learning means that students participate in class or engage in physical activities that relate to the subject matter rather than listening to a lecture or watching a demonstration. This may include the use of manipulatives to teach concepts. Therefore, we will focus on this evidence-based strategy to support achievement. This systematic approach to instruction will help to meet student needs and master content. The use of key laboratory documents, scientific journals, and data trackers to inform instructional decisions and planning will promote data-driven conversations that include OPMs to remediated benchmarks as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Hands-on labs ensures that teachers use current and aligned data to plan tailored lessons that meet students' needs. Continuous adjustments to lessons, plans, and lesson delivery as new data become available.

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.

By September 29, review curriculum with science teachers to align with state standards and assessment goals. They will identify key concepts and skills that need to be reinforced and ensure they are adequately addressed in the curriculum. Develop documents on the scope and sequence of science topics across grade levels. Therefore, they will begin to teach standards-based curriculum using appropriate pedagogical and instructional resources.

Person Responsible: Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

By September 29, the science liaison will organize monthly professional development sessions for science teachers on effective instructional strategies, differentiated instruction techniques, and hands-on demonstrations in the labs. This will provide opportunities for teachers to share best practices, collaborate on lesson planning, and help teachers engage students in interactive and experiential learning.

Person Responsible: Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

By September 29, the leadership team will begin conducting walk-throughs to ensure that hands-on activities and teacher instruction are implemented in a way that differentiates instruction according to data results.

Person Responsible: Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

By September 29, implementation of the hands-on laboratory activities will reflect the benchmarks tested for mastery of district and state assessments as part of the progress monitoring data collection and review. Based on the data analysis, action plans will be developed to address specific weaknesses and adjust instructional strategies accordingly.

Person Responsible: Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

By September 29, teachers will meet with science liaison as needed to reassign students based on progress monitoring data to remediate the lowest scoring benchmarks and adjust instruction to meet student needs.

Person Responsible: Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

By September 29, the leadership team will continue to conduct walk-throughs to ensure that hands-on activities and teacher instruction are implemented in a way that allows for differentiation according to data results.

Person Responsible: Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

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

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

According to the 2023 FAST PM3 ELA data, the school's overall performance is 57%. The data reflects that 56% of third grade students are proficient, 48% of fourth graders, and 66% of fifth grade students are proficient in ELA. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors, we will implement targeted intervention to improve or proficiency rates. These implementations will be supported by the usage of mini-lessons with the assistance of the Reading Coach.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of targeted intervention, ELA proficiency will increase by 7 percentage points in grades three, four, and five, as measured by students' performance on FAST PM1 and FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will conduct quarterly data chats and conduct regular walk-throughs to ensure that instruction aligned to the standards is implemented with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Williams (pr4001@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.)

Targeted intervention is a focused and personalized approach that aims to address the specific learning needs of individual students or groups who may be struggling academically. It involves identifying a student's exact challenges, tailoring strategies to address those challenges, and providing additional support to bridge gaps in knowledge and skills. This approach goes beyond a one-size-fits-all approach and recognizes that each student has unique strengths and areas in need of improvement. We have identified targeted intervention as our evidence-based priority strategy to support an approach consistent with a personalized and inclusive learning environment. By identifying the specific learning needs of each student and tailoring interventions accordingly, we will ensure that each student receives the support they need. The use of targeted interventions will deepen understanding of student needs, improve instructional planning, and contribute to data-driven decision making.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By tailoring our approach to the individual needs of each learner, we will use small, student centered mini lessons to re-learn deficient skills. By identifying and addressing learning gaps early, we aim to prevent students from falling behind and give them the tools they need to succeed.

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.

By September 29, the test administrator will analyze F.A.S.T. data to identify students who will benefit from targeted interventions. This data will be used to categorize students based on their specific learning needs and areas in need of improvement.

Person Responsible: Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

By September 29, the test administrator will collaborate with ELA teachers, interventionists and coaches to design interventions based on students' strengths and weaknesses. They will develop individualized intervention plans for each identified student that establish clear goals, strategies, and measurable outcomes.

Person Responsible: Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

By September 29, the ELA liaison will collaborate with teachers to organize small group or individual tutoring sessions based on student need and availability. These sessions will be scheduled to minimize disruption as possible to the students' normal daily routines.

Person Responsible: LaTressia Barnett (lbarnett@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

By September 29, the leadership team will begin to have quarterly data conversations, adjust small groups based on current data in real time, and administration will follow up with consistent walk-throughs to ensure B.E.S.T. benchmarks and best practices are being reliably implemented. This will be an ongoing effort.

Person Responsible: Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

By September 29, the administration will continue walk-throughs and ongoing progress monitoring. An ongoing progress monitoring plan will be created to track each student's progress and adjust interventions as needed. The use of the district assessment calendar and ongoing progress monitoring will continue to achieve the outcomes targeted by teachers through interventions and small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

By September 29, the ELA liaison will hold regular meetings with teachers and interventionists to review student progress data. Use these meetings to discuss the effectiveness of interventions, share findings, and make data-driven adjustments to intervention plans.

Person Responsible: Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2022 - 2023 School Improvement Survey, 71% of teachers indicated that collaboration between departments and grade level members occurs weekly or monthly to improve student outcomes. Based on the data and identified contributing factors, we will implement targeted professional development initiatives focused on improving collaboration among staff. This will further strengthen collaboration across departments and grade levels, resulting in even more effective efforts to improve student outcomes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of targeted professional development initiatives, teacher collaboration will improve by 5 percentage points in the 2023-2024 school year as compared to the 71% indicated on the 2022-2023 School Improvement Survey. This comparison helps assess the effectiveness of targeted professional development initiatives in enhancing teacher collaboration within the school.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will monitor that targeted professional development initiatives are effectively fostering collaboration among staff by regularly evaluating the effectiveness of training initiatives through post-training surveys and feedback sessions. They will gather input from staff to assess the relevance, applicability, and impact of the training on their collaboration practices. This approach helps track progress, make informed decisions, and continually refine strategies to achieve better student outcomes through improved collaboration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Williams (pr4001@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 strategy of implementing targeted professional development initiatives focused on improving teacher collaboration is rooted in the school's commitment to improving student outcomes and creating a positive learning environment. The data analysis and identified factors provided insight into the importance of collaboration in achieving these goals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Targeted professional development is carefully designed to improve specific areas identified through data analysis, teacher feedback, and school improvement goals. Just as teachers differentiate instruction for students, targeted professional development addresses the diverse learning needs of teachers. The initiatives provide a range of options, resources, and strategies to meet different learning styles and preferences. By addressing specific needs, providing data-driven strategies, and fostering collaboration, these initiatives empower teachers to improve their instructional practices, leading to improved student outcomes and overall school success.

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.

By September 29, the PLST team will conduct a comprehensive survey of teachers to assess needs and identify specific areas within departments and grade levels that would benefit from improved collaboration.

Person Responsible: Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

By September 29, the leadership team will establish a structured framework for regular department and grade level meetings to discuss student data, instructional strategies, and progress toward goals.

Joint grade level meetings will establish common goals based on student outcomes and action plans to achieve those goals.

Person Responsible: Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

By September 29, the schedule of professional development training focusing on effective collaboration techniques, communication strategies and tools for departments and grade level staff will be created by the subject area liaisons and grade level chairs.

Person Responsible: Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

By September 29, the leadership team will facilitate weekly cross-curriculum planning sessions, align assessments, and identify opportunities for interdisciplinary learning. This will ensure they have the resources required for successful integration of topics across subjects.

Person Responsible: Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

By September 29, subject area liaisons will develop a standardized data analysis to guide departments and grade level members in analyzing student performance data collaboratively.

Person Responsible: Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

By September 29, administration will schedule monthly reflection sessions where educators assess the impact of collaborative efforts, identify areas for improvement, and make adjustments.

Person Responsible: Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2022 - 2023 School Climate Survey, 75% of the staff felt a lack of concern and support from the parents. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors, we will implement a comprehensive and inclusive family engagement program that fosters a partnership among parents, caregivers, and the school community. The aim is to establish a variety of inclusive events, workshops, and activities that are responsive to families' diverse backgrounds and schedules.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of a comprehensive and inclusive family engagement program, parental engagement opportunities will increase by 5 percentage points during the 2023 - 2024 academic school year.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will meet and discuss various events that will facilitate outreach and support to families. The evidence-based strategy will include parent workshops, Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) Assessment Orientation Night, Literacy Nights, Science Nights, Wellness Check-in, Parent Technology Workshop, and other parent involvement opportunities so families can be active participants in their child's education.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@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.)

Family engagement studies show that parental involvement is an important factor in student outcomes, including closing the achievement gap between different groups of students. Different families have different abilities to be involved, which means that schools should provide a range of opportunities for parents to get involved. Examples of family engagement activities include open houses, orientations, parent workshops, home visits, volunteer opportunities, and community events. The most important elements of a family engagement program are (1) building genuine and collaborative relationships with families, (2) conducting interactive sessions between faculty and families, and (3) linking all interactions to learning to build families' capacity to support their students' academic development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Parent involvement will ensure that students are supported emotionally and academically. This will improve student achievement and mental well-being. By providing opportunities for parents to connect with teachers, staff, and other families, we will foster a strong sense of community, empower parents to support their child's education, and create a collaborative environment where everyone's contributions are valued.

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.

By August 30, the school will host an open house and use the registration form to contact parents and encourage membership in PTA.

Person Responsible: Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 30

By September 29, the leadership team will develop a schedule that includes orientation, activities, events, workshops, and volunteer opportunities for parents and stakeholders. This will lay the foundation for a comprehensive and inclusive family engagement program.

Person Responsible: Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

By September 29, the leadership team implements a multi-faceted communication plan to inform parents of school activities, curriculum updates, and their child's progress. Multiple channels such as emails, newsletters, phone calls, and social media are used to ensure that parents are continually involved.

Person Responsible: Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

By When: By September 29

By September 29, the leadership team will create a survey to gather insight from parents about their concerns, expectations, and suggestions for improving parental involvement. In turn they will utilize the feedback to develop strategies to engage parents and demonstrate that the school values parents' opinions.

Person Responsible: Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

By September 29, the media specialist and teachers regularly post morning announcements by providing a link through Schoology and ClassDojo to engage parents and provide school-wide communication.

Person Responsible: Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

By September 29, the leadership team and lead teachers review the parental involvement trackers. Collection of registration forms and trackers will be monitored to make predictions about upcoming parental involvement events such as: Open House, Literacy Night, Science with a Twist, Dad's and DI, F.A.S.T. Night, Coffee & Conversations

Person Responsible: Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

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

-N/A-

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

According to the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) data for 2022 to 2023, 54% of fourth grade students scored below proficient in reading. Based on this data, it is evident that there is a need to improve our fifth grade reading scores. To improve student reading proficiency in ELA, teachers will use targeted interventions that are clear and skillful. Small group instruction, one-on-one instruction, and differentiated reading materials will be used to address areas of deficiency.

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

Each grade K-2 student, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, were 50 percent on track to pass the statewide ELA Assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

If we successfully implement targeted intervention for Tier 1 & Tier 2 student instruction in 5th grade, our ELA proficiency will increase by at least 5 percentage points, as indicated by our ELA FAST proficiency levels, which are 51% of fifth grade students.

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 focus area will be enhanced through the implementation of Academic Vocabulary, Instruction Tier 2 & 3

Intervention, weekly collaborative planning, and subsequent focused walk-throughs that monitor alignment of planning to instructional delivery. Teachers will engage in collaborative planning using instructional resources aligned to the standards. In addition, teachers will use bi-weekly assessments, unit assessments, and review of final products to track student progress and ensure that instructional delivery and planning have been effective.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Williams, Kevin, pr4001@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?

Under the targeted element of ELA, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of targeted intervention. Teachers will tailor instruction to meet student learning needs and provide additional support to struggling students. In addition, teachers will provide students with different levels of complexity so that all students in the class can learn effectively regardless of their varying abilities.

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?

Targeted intervention is a focused and personalized approach that aims to address the specific learning needs of individual students or groups who may be struggling academically. It involves identifying a student's exact challenges, tailoring strategies to address those challenges, and providing additional support to bridge gaps in knowledge and skills. This approach goes beyond a one-size-fits-all approach and recognizes that each student has unique strengths and areas in need of improvement. We have identified targeted intervention as our evidence-based priority strategy to support an approach consistent with a personalized and inclusive learning environment. By identifying the specific learning needs of

each student and tailoring interventions accordingly, we will ensure that each student receives the support they need. The use of targeted interventions will deepen understanding of student needs, improve instructional planning, and contribute to data-driven decision making.

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
By September 22, teachers will create small intervention groups made up of students who are underperforming in reading. They will develop lesson plans that target identified skill gaps and focus on building foundational reading skills, with an emphasis on standards-aligned instruction in Tier 1 and Tier 2.	Cartwright-Rind, Tracy, tcartwright@dadeschools.net
By October 13, the Reading liaison and teachers will conduct data analysis of progress monitoring assessments bi-weekly to assess the effectiveness of the strategies selected for ELA.	Cartwright-Rind, Tracy, tcartwright@dadeschools.net
By October 27, the administration will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the effectiveness of the implementation of the strategies selected for Reading.	Williams, Kevin, pr4001@dadeschools.net
By October 27, conduct quarterly data chats with teachers to monitor student performance based on targeted intervention progress and support teachers with regrouping students for small group instruction as needed. As a result, teachers will develop classroom groups based on the current data trend to provide academic support to increase student performance.	Cartwright-Rind, Tracy, tcartwright@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.

Norwood is committed to building a positive school culture and environment by cultivating supportive interactions, meaningful connections between adults through hosting activities, establishing protocols to foster professional relationships, and effective collaboration. Our strengths within the school culture are in the areas of

Relationships, Physical and Emotional Safety and Support, Caring, and Connections. Our school creates year-round experiences and team-building activities to connect with parents and families and ensure they have the information they need to support their children. Students are supported through internal mentoring programs and our peer power program. Employees have the opportunity to participate in team building activities and social seminars where we can celebrate success together.

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 stakeholders involved in building a positive school culture and environment are the principal, assistant

Principal, content liaisons, teachers, and counselors (our school leadership team). The Principal's role is to monitor and oversee all school initiatives and respond to morale issues by planning team-building and morale-building activities. Assistant principals oversee mentoring programs and help ensure that all information is shared with stakeholders in a timely manner. Teachers and content liaisons assist in providing and responding to stakeholder feedback. All stakeholders are responsible for making special efforts to connect and build relationships with students, parents, and families. This fosters a positive culture and environment at Norwood where mutual respect, honest communication/feedback, and respect for others are valued.

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)

Norwood is committed to strengthening the academic programs in the school and increase the amount and quality of learning time by providing afterschool tutoring in the areas of Reading, Mathematics and Science. weekly. Norwood also provides enrichment in the areas of Art and Music afterschool. In addition a partnership has been created with the City of Opa-Locka to provide afterschool Code Master program for students in 3-5th grade.

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))

During our Annual Title I meeting parents are given an overview of the Title I Parent Family Engagement plan. It is developed with parental collaboration. Here are some common strategies utilized at Norwood to assist; parent workshops (school offers workshops at various times), clear communication (communication via school website, flyers, and agendas), parental Involvement (parents participate in building a supportive school environment).

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))

Norwood is committed to ensuring that school based mental health services are provided to students to improve students' skill outside of academic subject areas thus a mental health counselor is provided twice weekly, and a school counselor daily. These individuals provide group and individual sessions to students and referrals to outside providers for students and families that are in 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))

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))

Norwood is committed to building a positive school culture and environment by cultivating supportive interactions, meaningful connections between students transitioning from early childhood education programs into elementary school programs, thus we provide a transition meet and greet for all early childhood parents and students to tour the school and the educational environment. During this tour they provided grade level expectations and a question-and-answer session is conducted.

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