

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Pinecrest Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Pinecrest Elementary School

10250 SW 57TH AVE, Miami, FL 33156

<http://pinecrestelementary.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.

In an ever-changing global community, Pinecrest Elementary is dedicated to developing lifelong learners who can cooperatively and successfully compete in a highly competitive technological world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pinecrest Elementary School is dedicated to nurturing each student's growth and pursuit of excellence in our dynamic multicultural and technological world. The Pinecrest Family believes in the unlimited ability of all students to become responsible and contributing citizens. Together, we will provide a secure and positive environment to stimulate intellectual development, enhance personal qualities, and foster respect for individual differences. As part of our mission to develop the whole child we are equally dedicated to encouraging creative endeavors, guiding students towards personal and emotional fulfillment, and providing health awareness for lifetime fitness. To this end, Pinecrest Elementary School seeks and welcomes the participation of all members of our community who share in this commitment.

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
Fraginals, Suzette	Principal	The principal leads the school community in the achievement of the school's vision and mission. The principal supports the instructional leaders, engages and collaborates with stakeholders, and guides the school's decision-making processes.
Zabala , Maria	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports instructional leaders, engages and collaborates with stakeholders, leads data analysis, facilitates professional development, and supports the school improvement process.
Mayo, Maria	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports instructional leaders, engages and collaborates with stakeholders, leads data analysis, and facilitates professional development.
Cereijo, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	The teacher leads and shares district information from the ELA department within the school.
Meyer, Norma	Teacher, PreK	The teacher leads and shares information from the Early Childhood Department and serves as the United Teachers of Dade (UTD) Steward who shares information on the union contract and ensures compliance.
Garcia, Michelle	ELL Compliance Specialist	The teacher leads and shares information from the Bilingual Department.

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.

Stakeholders will be involved by attending faculty meetings, department meetings, leadership meetings and EESAC meetings. By participating in these various meeting opportunities the stakeholders input will be implemented in the SIP process.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation by holding monthly Leadership meetings.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	72%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	20%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

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

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	1	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	9

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	8	5	5	3	6	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	2	8	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	1	9	0	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	5	7	5	8	0	0	0	25

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	1	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	9

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

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

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

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

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

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	1	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	9

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	85	60	53	90	62	56	87		
ELA Learning Gains				80			72		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				71			61		
Math Achievement*	89	66	59	90	58	50	82		
Math Learning Gains				74			62		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				66			51		
Science Achievement*	80	58	54	87	64	59	75		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	58	63	59	81			62		

* 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	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	394
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	97
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	52			
ELL	68			
AMI				
ASN	96			
BLK				
HSP	76			
MUL	92			
PAC				
WHT	91			
FRL	64			

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	61			
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN	98			
BLK				
HSP	77			

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	70			

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	85			89			80					58
SWD	46			57							2	
ELL	72			79			61				5	58
AMI												
ASN	92			100							2	
BLK												
HSP	81			85			75				5	63
MUL	92			92							2	
PAC												
WHT	90			95			89				4	
FRL	68			75			69				5	50

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	90	80	71	90	74	66	87					81
SWD	65	61	59	64	62		56					
ELL	72	69	57	80	70	67	63					81
AMI												
ASN	100	90		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	86	79	69	87	69	62	83					80
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	96	81		95	80		93					
FRL	75	72	53	75	73	58	72					84

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	87	72	61	82	62	51	75					62
SWD	47	50		50	40		40					
ELL	77	73	64	65	58	46	67					62
AMI												
ASN	100			95								
BLK	73			67								
HSP	83	68	54	75	60	38	69					60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	95	76	80	92	63	75	85					
FRL	68	73	53	59	58	50	52					62

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	91%	58%	33%	58%	33%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	78%	52%	26%	50%	28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	91%	63%	28%	59%	32%
04	2023 - Spring	92%	64%	28%	61%	31%
05	2023 - Spring	84%	58%	26%	55%	29%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	80%	50%	30%	51%	29%

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was the Third grade 2023 ELA Fast data. According to the data 78% of the students tested in Third grade scored proficiency. Learning gaps caused by interruptions to education in the past two and a half school years are likely to be contributing factors to student performance.

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

The 2023 Statewide Science Assessment data showed the greatest decline. The data indicates a 7 percentage point decline in students proficiency from 87% student proficiency in 2022 to 80% proficiency in 2023. Learning gaps caused by interruptions to education in the past two and a half school years are likely to be contributing factors to student performance.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The FAST ELA and MATH data surpassed the state proficiency percentage. The 2023 Fast ELA data showed 86% student proficiency in comparison to the state where the data indicated 54% proficiency, that is a 32 percentage point difference above the state proficiency percentage. In addition, the 2023 Fast Math data showed 89% student proficiency in comparison to the state where the data indicated

58% proficiency, that is a 31 percentage point difference above the state proficiency percentage. In 2022-2023, data analysis was at the forefront of department meetings, common planning time, and parent teacher conferences. All struggling students were offered multiple avenues to receive additional support in ELA and Math including tutoring before school and after school. Also the implementation of school-wide challenges also motivated the students and provided positive reinforcement.

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

The FAST Math Progress Monitoring 3 (PM3) data indicates that there has been a notable increase in the number of students who have achieved proficiency in mathematics throughout the school year. The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 decreased from 25% in PM1 to 16% in PM3. Although there was a decline, it is important to note that the overall proficiency percentage increased, suggesting that more students progressed to higher levels. The percentage of students scoring level 4 increased from 21% in PM 1 to 28% in PM3. This indicates growth in the number of students performing at a higher level of proficiency. The most substantial growth occurred in the percentage of students scoring level 5, with an increase from 8% in PM1 to 45% in PM3. Overall, the percentage of students scoring proficiency increased from 54% in PM1 to 89% in PM3. This indicates a significant improvement in the number of students demonstrating advanced proficiency in mathematics. This school year the focus was on Data-Driven decision making to ensure targeted instruction. Teachers used iXL and iReady to provide students with individualized instruction and practice. In addition, the school implemented a Reflex Math challenge throughout the year.

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

Attendance and Reading Proficiency

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

- 1.Attendance
- 2.Academic Achievement (Reading, Math, Science Proficiency)
- 3.Progress Monitoring Assessments (Data Driven Instruction)
- 4.Schoology Implementation

Area of Focus

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

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

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

According to the 2022-2023 FAST data, 86% of 3rd-5th grade students were proficient in ELA as compared to the district average of 51%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors related to the high number of students with disabilities (SWD), it has become apparent that student readiness levels are hindered by the current lack of emphasis on cross-curricular collaboration. In order to address this limitation effectively, we have decided to implement the Targeted Element of Collaborative Planning as a strategic solution.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement collaborative planning, then end of year FAST PM 3 data will reflect a five percentage point increase in ELA proficiency from 86% to 91%.

Monitoring:

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

The School Leadership team will hold monthly Curriculum Corrals where teachers will be given the opportunity to plan and collaborate with departmentalized partners. The Leadership team will perform walkthroughs during these meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzette Friginals (sfraginals@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 Collaborative Planning, our school will ensure that teachers have a voice in sharing and planning. As a result, the Leadership team will work together to ensure that support provided is teacher led, designed to be engaging, support collegiality, and continues throughout the school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborative planning will allow us to maintain a focus on continually improving and providing support based on teacher and student needs.

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.

Develop and share with teachers a meeting schedule and guide of expectations for working collaboratively at the Curriculum Corrals. As a result, the teachers will know what to work on together and use their planning time efficiently.

Person Responsible: Suzette Fraginals (sfraginals@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/06/23

Teachers will be given the opportunity to meet for cross curricular collaborative planning every month. This initiative will help create connections with teacher partners, help students academically and professionally by building working relationships.

Person Responsible: Suzette Fraginals (sfraginals@dadeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers will watch and promote the Science vocabulary word of the day on WPEN Morning announcements. As a result, the students will make cross curricular connections in reading and science.

Person Responsible: Suzette Fraginals (sfraginals@dadeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on the data review, our school will implement the Targeted Element of Instructional Coaching/ Professional Learning. Data from 2022 Professional Development Needs Survey indicates that 25.86% of teachers would benefit from Teacher Driven Observation.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By February 2024, our aim is for 90% of K-5 ELA and Mathematics teachers to express that they are experiencing tangible benefits from the professional development opportunities provided by means of Teacher Driven Observation.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team and Professional Development Liaison will meet monthly and plan PDs and department meetings based on areas of need as indicated by teachers. They will discuss what has been successful at previous PDs and what areas can be improved upon. A focus on providing relevant PDs will be maintained throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzette Friginals (sfraginals@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 Professional Learning, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Effective Curriculum and Resource Utilization. Professional development will focus on how teachers can use hard copy and digital curriculum resources to enhance their lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective Curriculum and Resource Utilization will ensure that teachers are utilizing resources that have been designed specifically to meet the needs of all students in each grade level. Additionally, with new tools available to teachers within the McGraw-Hill Wonders reading series and the FAST assessment data, it is imperative that teachers receive professional development and ongoing support from teacher leaders within the school.

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.

Teachers will participate in training sessions using tailored workshops, ensuring interactive and hands-on activities. As a result, teachers will get to practice and receive immediate feedback from peers.

Person Responsible: Suzette Friginals (sfraginals@dadeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers will participate in B.E.S.T. standards professional developments. As a result, teachers will feel prepared to create lesson plans that include effective instruction.

Person Responsible: Suzette Friginals (sfraginals@dadeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers will attend monthly department meetings where department chairs will collaborate and instruct the staff on new resources, strategies, and information. As a result, teachers will be able to identify all the resources provided by the series and how to use them in their planning and instruction.

Person Responsible: Suzette Friginals (sfraginals@dadeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

#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.

Based on the data review, our school will implement the targeted Element of Social Emotional Learning. The 2022-2023 Student School Climate Survey indicated that 21% of students believed that "bullying is a problem" at the school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Through the integration of Social Emotional Learning, our students are projected to reduce their concerns pertaining to bullying by 5 percentage points, as highlighted in the findings of the 2023 School Climate Survey.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team, school counselor, and media specialist will work together to help teachers encourage the use of positive activities in class such as daily classroom "shout outs", reflective journaling, and discussions based on SEL "check-ins" provided by the school counselor.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzette Fragnals (sfragnals@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 Social Emotional Learning, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Restorative Justice Practices (RJP). Our school counselors will share specific RJP strategies with teachers to incorporate in the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School operations provided training to selected school personnel on RJP during the previous school year. Upon school-wide implementation last year, these practices proved effective in building community and reducing conflict with students at the school. As a result, school-wide implementation of RJP will continue this year.

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.

Counselors will email weekly RJP Check-in prompts to facilitate community building in the classroom. As a result, there will be increased participation in RJP activities.

Person Responsible: Suzette Fraginals (sfraginals@dadeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers will effectively use RJP in the classroom to provide an open space for children to talk and express their feelings. As a result, teachers will see a change in classroom behavior and more engagement from students.

Person Responsible: Suzette Fraginals (sfraginals@dadeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

Counselors will promote district's Values Matter program through Parrot Club. Students who exemplify the core value of the month, will be recognized by the class and school. As a result, students will make an effort to model the core value of the month

Person Responsible: Suzette Fraginals (sfraginals@dadeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Based on the data review, our school will implement the Targeted Element of Small Group Instruction. We selected the overarching area of Small Group Instruction based on our findings that demonstrated proficiency in Mathematics were higher than proficiency in ELA. The overall Proficiency in Math were 89 percentage points and overall Learning Gains in ELA were 86 percentage points. A focus on Small Group Instruction, specifically in the area of ELA, will allow teachers to differentiate instruction based on the specific needs of each student using assessment data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Through the successful implementation of Small Group Instruction, our objective is to attain a two percentage point increase in ELA Proficiency, as evidenced by the Spring 2024 FAST PM3 assessment data, resulting in a 91% proficiency rate.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team will hold monthly meetings to discuss student data and observable trends in differentiated instruction. The Leadership Team will work together to identify teacher and student needs and support teachers in data analysis and differentiating instruction. As a result, the assistant principal and teachers will work together to monitor the progress monitoring data of students in intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzette Friginals (sfriginals@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 Small Group Instruction, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Data-Driven Decision Making. As a result, teachers plan their interventions based on fluid student needs as indicated by data including Performance Matters data, FAST data, STAR assessment data, i-Ready diagnostics and i-Ready progress monitoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A focus on small group Data-Driven instruction will ensure that individual student needs are being targeted. Our data indicated a five-percentage point decrease in ELA and a seven-percentage point decrease in Science proficiency. In addition, mathematics data only increased by one percentage point therefore the data indicates that all students will benefit from additional support. As a result, teachers will use data to meet the needs of those students and help them make learning gains and achieve proficiency.

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.

Teachers will continuously analyze student data to monitor progress. This meticulous review ensures that educators can effectively organize small groups and refine differentiated instruction lessons based on precise and dependable insights.

Person Responsible: Suzette Friginals (sfraginals@dadeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers will be trained on how to interpret assessment results and translate them into targeted instructional strategies. As a result, teachers will ensure that student needs are being met.

Person Responsible: Suzette Friginals (sfraginals@dadeschools.net)

By When: ongoing

Teachers will use iReady lessons to support student instruction and provide differentiated lessons based on Topic Assessment data. As a result, students will benefit from individualized online reteach opportunities.

Person Responsible: Suzette Friginals (sfraginals@dadeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing