



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>25</b>

# Palmetto Elementary School

12401 SW 74TH AVE, Miami, FL 33156

<http://pes.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 Palmetto Elementary School is to provide an outstanding education within an effective learning environment that addresses the individual needs of all students, thereby developing life-long learners who demonstrate pride, respect, and excellence in all endeavors.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

The vision of Palmetto Elementary School is to create life-long learners who consistently strive for excellence in our multicultural 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
Torres, Eric	Principal	Principal: Mr. Torres facilitates and conducts meetings by providing current data and support documents. The Principal guides the leadership team through a process of problem solving issues and concerns that arise through an ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well-being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention.
Nemec, Kristen	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal: Ms. Nemec works as a leadership team member to ensure commitment to the goals set forth. Along with the principal and teachers, she works on building staff support, internal capacity, and sustainability over time. Ms. Nemec also assists with monitoring the curriculum on a continuous basis. She ensures the collection of data, the implementation of Interventions, ongoing progress monitoring of MTSS/RtI intervention groups, and support professional development activities and technical assistance for teachers regarding databased instructional planning.
DeAlejo, Lisette	Other	PD Liaison: Ms. DeAlejo facilitates on-site professional development opportunities by proposing and/or delivering school based professional learning that supports the school's strategic goals and objectives and collaborates with school leadership team, PDE, Region Center and school administrators to identify PD needs.
Bogert, Aileen	Other	Science Liaison: Ms. Bogert attends monthly district ICAD meetings. She provides teachers with professional development in the area of Science. She provides teachers with instructional support through coaching, modeling, conferencing, and collaborative planning. In addition Ms. Bogert analyzes student data, leads intervention action planning for MTSS/RtI Tier 2/3 students, and serves as the Gradebook Chairperson.
Viquez, Maritza	Other	Math Liaison: Ms. Maritza Viquez attends monthly district ICAD meetings. She provides teachers with professional development and support in the area of Mathematics. She provides teachers with instructional support through coaching, modeling, conferencing, and collaborative planning. In addition Ms. Viquez analyzes student data, and leads intervention action planning for MTSS/RtI Tier 2/3 students.
Astuto, Julie	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor: Ms. Astuto implements the Values Matter Initiative, along with other programs designed to prevent abuse, bullying, drug use, and so forth. She also provides quality services and expertise on intervention with at-risk students. In collaboration with the school social worker and mental health coordinator, she continues to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success. She participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans and provides support for intervention with fidelity and documentation. She provides counseling for

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		students that are identified as at-risk or or having the potential to be at-risk..

Fuentes, Idalvis	Other	ESOL and World Language teacher, EESAC Chair: Ms. Fuentes is the EESAC Chair and also is the lead for ESOL testing and World language classes.
------------------	-------	--

**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.

At Palmetto Elementary School, stakeholders play a vital role in our School Improvement Plan (SIP). We have a School Leadership Team (SLT) that oversees the process and facilitates communication. Teachers and staff contribute through common planning sessions with administration. In addition, parents, students, and families provide input through surveys and Parent Teacher Association meetings, conferences, and electronic communication. External stakeholders are engaged through alignment of our programs and activities. We fulfill ESSA requirements through a monthly School Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting. The input gathered from all stakeholders shapes our SIP that reflects our school vision.

**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))

It is imperative to monitor and evaluate the School Improvement Plan (SIP). This ensures effectiveness and measures the impact on increasing achievement for proficiency. Palmetto Elementary School will establish a framework to monitor key components:

1. Data Collection: Collecting data, i.e. assessments, attendance, student performance and discipline to identify trends and areas for improvement.
2. Regular Data Analysis: Analyzing various data points to make revisions for the SIP.
3. Classroom Observations: Regular walkthroughs will be conducted by administration to assess instructional practices and student engagement.
4. Stakeholder feedback: Gathering perceptions and perspectives through surveys, meetings, and activities.

The school will revise the SIP by:

1. Analyzing Data: Monitoring data, assessment results, and stakeholder feedback to identify SIP improvements.
2. Identifying strategies: Collaborating with stakeholders to develop targeted strategies for improvement.
3. Modifying goals and action steps: Aligning the SIP goals, objectives, and action steps with strategies and updated needs.



4. Implementing revisions: Communicating the revised SIP with stakeholders and taking steps to effectively implement the updated plan.
5. Ongoing evaluation: We will continuously monitor and evaluate the revised plan using the established framework and communicating revisions.

Palmetto Elementary School will regularly monitor the implementation of the SIP noting the indicators mentioned to revise as needed. The plan ensures continuous improvement and compliance with ESSA 1114(b)(3) requirements.

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	63%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	24%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**Early Warning Systems**

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	3	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	3	4	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	4	8	5	7	6	0	0	0	31

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

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

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	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

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

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

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

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	1	1	6	2	0	0	0	10

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	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	2	0	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	5	4	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	3	1	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	6	3	10	7	7	0	0	0	39

**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	1	4	2	1	0	0	0	8

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	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*	86	60	53	89	62	56	83		
ELA Learning Gains				77			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			45		
Math Achievement*	90	66	59	91	58	50	81		
Math Learning Gains				82			65		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				86			50		
Science Achievement*	85	58	54	84	64	59	73		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	65	63	59	71			81		

\* 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	82
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	411
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	80

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	639
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	55			
ELL	71			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK				
HSP	82			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	90			
FRL	68			

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	53			
ELL	76			
AMI				
ASN	100			
BLK				
HSP	75			

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	89			
FRL	69			

**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	86			90			85					65
SWD	57			57							3	
ELL	76			72			70				4	65
AMI												
ASN	82			91							2	
BLK												
HSP	86			87			86				5	65
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	89			96			82				4	
FRL	67			72			71				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	89	77	59	91	82	86	84					71
SWD	56	47	44	65	67	62	27					
ELL	83	75		83	69							71
AMI												
ASN	100			100								

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	87	74	46	88	80	79	82					67
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	92	82	83	93	83	100	90					
FRL	71	59	45	80	80	80	71					

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	83	64	45	81	65	50	73					81
SWD	40	38		43	54		36					
ELL	70	50		73	50		50					81
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57			64								
HSP	83	58	46	77	53	43	63					73
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	88	72		89	79		86					
FRL	60	48	20	60	48	50	61					

**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	88%	56%	32%	54%	34%
04	2023 - Spring	89%	58%	31%	58%	31%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	85%	52%	33%	50%	35%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	86%	63%	23%	59%	27%
04	2023 - Spring	92%	64%	28%	61%	31%
05	2023 - Spring	91%	58%	33%	55%	36%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	82%	50%	32%	51%	31%

### 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.**

Grade 3 ELA had the lowest performance of 85% proficient. This decrease is not a trend, however implementing intervention with targeted students will assist in increasing this data point.

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

Grade 3 ELA had the greatest decline in performance from the previous year. A factor contributing is the Learning Loss from gaps of instruction in grade 1 and kindergarten due to the pandemic.

**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.**

Grade 5 Science had the largest gap of a 40 point difference. Grade 5 scored higher than the state average. Implementing Science intervention and reteaching from the mid-year data of deficient benchmarks contributed to the higher performance of proficiency.

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



Grade 5 Science had the most improvement of 9 percentage point increase. Implementing Science intervention and reteaching from the mid-year data of deficient benchmarks contributed to the higher performance of proficiency.

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

Areas of concern is to target students not meeting proficiency. Although, Palmetto is above 50% proficient, we strive to improve for all students.

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

1. Non-Proficient students (Reading, Math, Science)
2. Attendance

### **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 the 2022-2023 FAST PM3 proficiency data, 85% of our 3rd grade ELA students demonstrated proficiency, which is a decrease from 90% of the previous year.. Based on the data and the identified decrease in proficiency, we will focus on ELA intervention to increase proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If teachers implement Flexible/Strategic Grouping within ELA, then the third grade proficiency will increase by 5% points evidenced by the FAST PM3 assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

The Leadership Team will conduct quarterly data chats following iReady and Progress Monitoring Assessments. Weekly walkthroughs will be conducted to ensure Standards-Aligned Instruction is implemented daily with fidelity in whole group and Intervention.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kristen Nemec (knemec@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

Within the Targeted Element of ELA, our school will focus on the evidence based strategy of Flexible/Strategic Grouping. Teachers will execute lessons based on the standards/learning targets and ensure that all student products and teaching techniques are aligned to intended benchmarks. Students will show evidence of mastering the lesson objective/s through their work samples/assessments.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Strategically grouping and regrouping students for a variety of purposes throughout the school day or during an instructional unit supports the learning of all students. Flexible grouping strategies are used to meet curricular goals, engage students, and respond to individual needs. Flexible grouping helps teachers overcome the

disadvantages of ability grouping while still attending to individual performance issues. Both teacher-led and student-led groups will contribute to learning, but grouping decisions should respond to the dynamics inherent in each type of group. Teacher-led groups are the most common configuration—whole-class, small group, and individual instruction—and provide an efficient way of introducing material, summing-up conclusions from individual groups, meeting the common learning needs of a large or small group, and providing individual attention or instruction. Student-led groups take many forms, but share a common feature—that students control the group dynamics and have a voice in setting the agenda. Student-led groups provide opportunities for divergent thinking and encourage students to take responsibility for their own learning.

**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.

Provide Professional Development for teachers on effective implementation of Flexible/Strategic Grouping determined by student performance and need. As a result, teachers will strategically group students for intervention that is aligned to student data.

**Person Responsible:** Lisette DeAlejo (Idealejo@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23-9/29/23

Teachers and administrators will conduct Data Chats ( Teacher-Student, Teacher-Administration) to determine areas of strength and address student needs. As a result, teachers will identify student groups for intervention.

**Person Responsible:** Kristen Nemec (knemec@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23-9/29/23

Teachers will attend Collaborative Planning to lesson plan for explicit instruction of targeted groups and address student needs based on student data.

**Person Responsible:** Kristen Nemec (knemec@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23-9/29/23

**#2. 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 FAST proficiency data, 86% of our 3rd grade students and 92% of our 4th grade students are proficient in Math. This is a 2% in grade 3 and a 1% in grade 4 decrease from the previous year. Based on the data we will focus on differentiation instruction to increase proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If teachers implement differentiated instruction within Math, then the 3rd and 4th grade proficiency will increase 5 percentage points in the area listed as evidenced by the FAST PM3 Assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

The Leadership Team will conduct quarterly data chats following iReady and Progress Monitoring Assessments. Weekly walk-throughs will be conducted to ensure that Standards-Aligned Instruction is implemented daily with fidelity in whole group with a focus on differentiated instruction.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kristen Nemec (knemec@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

Within the targeted element of Math, our school will focus on the evidence based strategies of differentiated instruction. Teachers will execute lessons based on the standards aligned curriculum and implement differentiated instruction to meet the needs of the students. Evidence of mastery will be shown through student work samples, district assessments and progress monitoring assessments.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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. Research demonstrates this method benefits a wide range of 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.

Provide Professional Development for teachers on effective Differentiated Instruction that is aligned to Math benchmarks and student needs. As a result, teachers will identify specific student groups and instructional strategies and resources to facilitate instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Lisette DeAlejo (Idealejo@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23-9/29/23

Teachers and administrators will conduct Data Chats ( Teacher-Student, Teacher-Administration) to determine areas of strength and address student needs. As a result, teachers will identify student groups for Differentiated Instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Kristen Nemec (knemec@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23-9/29/23

Teachers will attend Collaborative Planning to lesson plan for explicit instruction of targeted Differentiated Instruction groups and address student needs based on student data.

**Person Responsible:** Kristen Nemec (knemec@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23-9/29/23

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

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

According to to PowerBI, the area of concern identified is attendance. Based on attendance data, 103 students were absent 10-14 days and 58 students were absent 15+ days. This is an increase to last year's attendance record. Based on the data the increase in student absences may be a contributing factor to the decrease in proficiency in ELA and Math.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

If the school implements an attendance initiative program (rewards and incentives), student attendance will increase by 2% as evidenced by the daily attendance bulletin and PowerBI data on a quarterly basis.

#### Monitoring:

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

The Attendance Committee will conduct monthly monitoring of school attendance to identify students who are accruing more than 5 unexcused absences and begin the SCM process. Students with 15 or more will be flagged and a truancy packet will be initiated.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Astuto (jastuto@dadeschools.net)

#### Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Within the Targeted Element of Early Warning Systems, our school will focus on the evidence based strategy of Attendance Initiatives.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Strategic Attendance Initiatives involve close monitoring and reporting of student absences, calls to parents, and more direct measures including home visits, counseling and referrals to outside agencies as well as incentives for students with perfect attendance.

#### 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.

Implement an attendance incentive program via school-site morning announcements for students who are present, on time, and in uniform. As a result students will be rewarded and incentivized for being present in school.

**Person Responsible:** Julie Astuto (jastuto@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23-9/29/23

Teachers will participate with the school-wide class reward system for Perfect Attendance. As a result, classes with Perfect Attendance will be incentivized.

**Person Responsible:** Julie Astuto (jastuto@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23-9/29/23

The Attendance Committee will meet quarterly to identify students with 15 or more absences to begin the truancy packet process, identify students with 5 or more to begin the referral process, and revisit school initiatives for attendance..

**Person Responsible:** Kristen Nemec (knemec@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23-9/29/23

#### #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

##### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

According to the 2022-2023 Statewide Science Assessment 82% of the 5th grade students are proficient in Science. Based on the data and the identified 82% proficient students, we will focus on student engagement to increase proficiency by 5% in Science.

##### Measurable Outcome:

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

If teachers implement student engagement strategies within science, then 5th grade proficiency will increase by 5% as evidenced by the Statewide Science Assessment.

##### Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will conduct quarterly data chats following district assessments. Weekly walkthroughs will be conducted to ensure that student engagement is utilized with fidelity and aligned to standards-based instruction.

##### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristen Nemec (knemec@dadeschools.net)

##### Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Within the targeted element of Student Engagement, our school will focus on the evidence based intervention of Differentiated Instruction (DI). We will utilize EduSmart to support DI. Teachers will use the Mid-Year Assessment to execute lessons based on the standards aligned curriculum and implement differentiated instruction to meet the needs of Student Engagement. In addition, the teachers will hold After school Science Camp to further enrich the Student Engagement of Science Instruction. Evidence of mastery will be shown through student work samples, district assessments and performance on Statewide Science Assessment.

##### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Student Engagement enables a student to fully participate bringing students to high levels of skill and comprehension.

##### 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.

Provide Professional Development for teachers on effective student engagement that is aligned to Statewide Science Assessment benchmarks. As a result, teachers will identify specific engagement strategies to facilitate instruction.



**Person Responsible:** Lisette DeAlejo (Idealejo@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23-9/29/23

Teachers and administrators will conduct Data Chats ( Teacher-Student, Teacher-Administration) to determine areas of strength and address student needs. As a result, teachers will identify engagement strategies to align instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Kristen Nemec (knemec@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23-9/29/23

Teachers will provide Afterschool Intervention for select standards and students to include identified Engagement Strategies. As a result, students will have appropriate strategies to enable high level thinking for comprehension of content.

**Person Responsible:** Aileen Bogert (abogert@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23-9/29/23

## 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: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>

### Budget Approval

**Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.**

Yes