

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Pine Lake Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 0 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 24 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 27 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 28 |

Pine Lake Elementary School

16700 SW 109TH AVE, Miami, FL 33157

<http://pinelake.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.

At Pine Lake Elementary School, we strive to provide the highest quality, relevant learning experiences that foster lifelong curiosity. So that all our students are empowered to achieve their full academic, personal, and civic potential, while becoming responsible citizens, and protectors of our global environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Pine Lake Elementary School, we are committed to inspiring, valuing, educating and empowering students through academic excellence and environmental awareness, in and beyond the classroom.

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 |
|-----------------------|------------------------|--|
| Coffey, Crystal | Principal | ccoffey@dadeschools.net Mrs. Coffey is the school's administrative leader. She guides the team and ensures the teachers and students have all the support and resources necessary to be successful. |
| Rodriguez, Jacqueline | Assistant Principal | jackie@dadeschools.net Assistant Principal responsibilities- Ms. Rodriguez is responsible for assisting the school principal in the leadership, coordination, supervision and management of the school program and operations. |
| Cue, Sandra | Assistant Principal | sandracue@dadeschools.net Assistant Principal responsibilities- Ms. Cue is responsible for assisting the school principal in the leadership, coordination, supervision and management of the school program and operations. |
| Collins, Pat | Reading Coach | 148693@dadeschools.net The Reading coach provides coaching and other professional development support that enables teachers to think reflectively about improving student learning and implementing various instructional programs and practices. |
| Munoz, Yolanda | Math Coach | ymunoz@dadeschools.net The Math Coach works with classroom teachers in researching, preparing, guiding, and identifying resources while assisting with the full implementation and monitoring of the district's adopted math program in response to student achievement. |
| Arias, Michelle | Administrative Support | marias2@dadeschools.net Ms. Arias works with classroom teachers and administrators in researching, preparing, guiding, and identifying resources while assisting with the full implementation and monitoring of the district's adopted programs in response to student and teacher success. |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The SIP was developed in collaboration with the school leadership team. It will be presented to the teachers and key community stakeholders through a faculty meeting and EESAC meetings. Their feedback is incorporated and revisited throughout the year.

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 Leadership team meets weekly. Data chats are conducted with both teachers and students throughout the year. This drives the SIP updates and next steps and provides accountability. Additionally, the SIP is provided to key stakeholders through the EESAC several times a year.

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 | 97% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | N/A |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) 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: C |
| 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 | 9 | 14 | 12 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 23 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 26 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 12 | 26 | 68 | 56 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 213 | |

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 | 4 | 18 | 27 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 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 | 12 | 5 | 14 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 12 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | |

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 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |

The number of students identified retained:

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

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 | 12 | 5 | 14 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 12 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | |

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 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |

The number of students identified retained:

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

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* | 52 | 60 | 53 | 52 | 62 | 56 | 44 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 63 | | | 51 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 56 | | | 54 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 43 | 66 | 59 | 39 | 58 | 50 | 34 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 65 | | | 19 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 71 | | | 43 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 67 | 58 | 54 | 55 | 64 | 59 | 43 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 71 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 63 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 53 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 47 | 63 | 59 | 77 | | | 65 | | |

* 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 | 51 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 253 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

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

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 478 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD | 32 | Yes | 1 | |
| ELL | 53 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | | | |
| HSP | 55 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 49 | | | |

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 | 47 | | | |
| ELL | 64 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | | | |
| HSP | 63 | | | |

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|---------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 60 | | | |

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 | 52 | | | 43 | | | 67 | | | | | 47 |
| SWD | 27 | | | 27 | | | 50 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 59 | | | 44 | | | 67 | | | | 5 | 47 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 40 | | | 35 | | | 62 | | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 60 | | | 46 | | | 68 | | | | 5 | 48 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 49 | | | 40 | | | 72 | | | | 5 | 48 |

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 | 52 | 63 | 56 | 39 | 65 | 71 | 55 | | | | | 77 |
| SWD | 25 | 45 | | 23 | 76 | 60 | 33 | | | | | 70 |
| ELL | 65 | 84 | | 45 | 68 | | 45 | | | | | 77 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| BLK | 38 | 52 | | 32 | 69 | 70 | 56 | | | | | |
| HSP | 64 | 72 | | 45 | 62 | | 55 | | | | | 77 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 51 | 64 | 56 | 39 | 66 | 69 | 57 | | | | | 77 |

| 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 | 44 | 51 | 54 | 34 | 19 | 43 | 43 | | | | | 65 |
| SWD | 18 | 42 | | 21 | 14 | | 6 | | | | | |
| ELL | 54 | 60 | | 56 | 33 | | 60 | | | | | 65 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | 52 | | 23 | 14 | | 31 | | | | | |
| HSP | 52 | 56 | | 46 | 28 | | 63 | | | | | 64 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 42 | 50 | 54 | 33 | 20 | 43 | 42 | | | | | 65 |

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 | 48% | 56% | -8% | 54% | -6% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 59% | 58% | 1% | 58% | 1% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 38% | 52% | -14% | 50% | -12% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 41% | 63% | -22% | 59% | -18% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 35% | 64% | -29% | 61% | -26% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 59% | 58% | 1% | 55% | 4% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 54% | 50% | 4% | 51% | 3% |

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 lowest performance component data was in the area of our Mathematics FAST performance level with 51% proficiency. The contributing factors to last year's low performance was a result from the impact of the Pandemic. There was an inconsistency with student attendance and issues with WIFI and broadband connectivity during the Pandemic. Due to these factors students were making slower gains compared to that of in-person learning which leads to better academic outcomes, greater student engagement and higher rate of attendance. The current trends are positive and moving in the right direction through our supportive learning environment and interventions that ensure our students continue to access a high-quality and rigorous education, while meeting basic needs that address social emotional and mental health needs.

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

The Mathematics data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year with a 51% proficiency level. The factors that contributed to this decline was a result from the impact of the Pandemic. The previous past two years of remote learning have affected the students. Therefore, test scores have shown a decline in student performance levels. The learning loss and recovery goals were identified for support and a School-wide improvement Plan was developed to address the learning needs of the students.

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 data component with the greatest gap compared to the state average was in Grade 4. The Mathematics State score results with a 3 or above achievement level is 61% proficiency level as compared to our school with 43% proficiency level.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in Grade 4 ELA school performance level of 70% proficiency as compared to the State proficiency level of 58% and District proficiency level of 58%. The action steps included daily interventions, differentiated instruction, tutoring and an infused Magnet curriculum designed to enhance students' academic experience and challenge which complemented the core curriculum.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, the area of concern is the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency on the 22-23 FAST assessment. There are 213 students who fall into this category.

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

The highest priorities for the upcoming school improvement plan for our 2023-2024 school year is in the area of Mathematics proficiency overall. The other area with a high priority for our school improvement plan is to increase ELA Grade 3 proficiency levels and provide our retained grade three students with competency-based strategies that engage students with personalized learning opportunities

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 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 20202-2023 FAST PM3 data, 47% of 3rd grade students were proficient in math as compared to the state average of 59% and district average of 63%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: Teacher and student attendance and teacher turnover.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of an increase in hands on learning through manipulatives and e-tools, an additional 5% of students in grades three will score a level of 3 or above in the area of mathematics on the 2023-2024 State Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team (Coffey, Rodriguez, Arias, Collins, Munoz and Zajic) will conduct regular walkthroughs to ensure that hands on learning using manipulatives and e-tools is occurring on a daily basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacqueline Rodriguez (jackie@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.)

Our school will focus on the evidenced based strategy of hands on learning with manipulatives and e-tools. Hands-on learning allows students to learn through experiences and lets them immerse themselves in the learning environment. Hands-on learning also allows students to put their newly acquired skills to use.

.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Studies have shown that hands on learning or kinesthetic learning is the most successful way of learning with students. Kinesthetic learning is where a student carries out physical activities rather than listening to a lecture. Working with manipulatives helps students gain a superior understanding of the material.

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.

08/14/23-09/29/23

Professional Development for teachers on incorporating hands on learning through manipulatives and e-tools that is aligned to the school goals based on data.

Person Responsible: Yolanda Munoz (ymunoz@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23-09/29/23

08/14/23-09/29/23

During common planning, the math coach (Ms. Munoz) will work with teachers to identify what hands on resources can be used for each skill.

Person Responsible: Yolanda Munoz (ymunoz@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/31-09/29/23

08/14/23-09/29/23

Teachers will utilize a variety of manipulatives and e-tool resources to support student learning.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Rodriguez (jackie@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/31-09/29/23

08/14/23-09/29/23

Teachers and students will track Progress Monitoring Assessments to monitor student progress.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Rodriguez (jackie@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/31-09/29/23

#2. 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.

According to the 2022-2023 FAST PM3 data, 42% of 3rd grade students were proficient in ELA as compared to the state average of 50% and district average of 52%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of student centered small group differentiated learning, an additional 5% of students in grades three will score a level of 3 or above in the area of ELA on the 2023-2024 State Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team (Coffey, Rodriguez, Collin, and Arias) will conduct quarterly data chats, adjust groups based on current data in real time, and follow up with regular walkthroughs to ensure that student centered small group differentiated learning is aligned to current data. Administration will review biweekly ELA DI lesson plans for indication of student centered small group differentiated learning. Data analysis of formative assessments will be reviewed monthly to track progress. The data will be analyzed during Leadership Team Meetings to ensure students are demonstrating growth on B.E.S.T. standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Pat Collins (148693@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.)

Our school will focus on the evidenced based strategy of student centered small group differentiated learning, which will assist in accelerating ELA proficiency in third grade students as it utilizes a variety of educational and learning experiences to meet the students needs. Data driven instruction will be monitored through the use of data trackers to drive instructional planning and data driven conversations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Student centered small group differentiated learning, will ensure that teachers are using a systematic approach to learning to meet the needs of the learners. Teachers will target the specific needs of the 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.

08/15/23

Professional Development for teachers on student centered small group differentiated learning, that is aligned to the school goals based on data.

Person Responsible: Pat Collins (148693@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/15

08/14/23-09/29/23

Teachers will develop lesson plans that are inclusive of student centered small group differentiated learning, As a result, teachers will have student groups identified and all resources needed.

Person Responsible: Pat Collins (148693@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/31-09/29/23

08/14/23-09/29/23

Teachers will utilize a variety of instructional tools to support student centered small group differentiated learning,

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Rodriguez (jackie@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23-09/29/23

08/14/23-09/29/23

Teachers and students will track Progress Monitoring Assessments to monitor student progress.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Rodriguez (jackie@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23-09/29/23

#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 2022-2023 School Climate Survey, only 35% of the staff felt that morale was high, in comparison to 75% on the 21-22 School Climate survey. This indicates a decrease of 40 percentage points overall. This data indicates that there is a critical need to increase staff morale.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement increasing staff morale, our staff morale will increase by 20 percentage points on the 23-24 School Climate Survey.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team(Coffey, Rodriguez, Arias, Collins, Munoz and Zajic) will plan activities on early release days so that teachers and administrators can build a rapport. Faculty meetings will begin with an opportunity for connection and teachers will have time during every meeting to ensure that all input is considered. Leadership Team will survey teachers to garner ideas on initiatives/ strategies that they would like to have implemented in the school. Based on survey responses, teachers will volunteer to lead different initiatives and showcase their leadership skills.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacqueline Rodriguez (jackie@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 area of focus of positive culture and environment, we will focus on empowering teachers and staff to ensure that our faculty and staff have a voice and can participate in the decision making process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We want to empower teachers in our school by involving them in the decision making process. Leading initiatives will provide faculty and staff an opportunity to have their voice heard while increasing staff morale.

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.

08/14/23-09/29/23

Survey the faculty and staff to accurately capture their input and suggestions. Results will be collected virtually.

Person Responsible: Yolanda Munoz (ymunoz@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23-09/29/23

08/14/23-09/29/23

Leadership Team will review the results of the survey and brainstorm activities and opportunities for the faculty and staff to share their talents and leadership potential.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Rodriguez (jackie@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23-09/29/23

08/14/23-09/29/23

On early release days, Leadership will provide team building opportunities for the teachers based on the survey results.

Person Responsible: Pat Collins (148693@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23-09/29/23

08/14/23-09/29/23

Leadership will provide opportunities for health and wellness for the faculty and staff afterschool, including mindfulness and meditation practices.

Person Responsible: Michelle Arias (marias2@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23-09/29/23

#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.

Currently there are 213 students that have been identified as students with substantial reading deficiencies. Factors that contributed to these deficiencies include attendance, level 1 performance scores on state assessments in ELA, and course failure grades in the area of ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of student centered small group instruction, students with a substantial Reading deficiency will decrease by 20% on the 2023-2024 State Assessment, in the Spring.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team (Coffey, Rodriguez, Collins, Arias, Munoz and Zajic) will conduct quarterly data chats, and follow up with regular walkthroughs to ensure that student centered small group instruction is aligned to current data. Data analysis of formative assessments will be reviewed monthly to track progress. The data will be analyzed during Leadership Team Meetings to ensure students are demonstrating growth on B.E.S.T. standards. Extended learning opportunities will be provided to those students who are not showing growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacqueline Rodriguez (jackie@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 elements to decrease the reading deficiencies will focus on specific instructional practices. Differentiated Instruction will be implemented through weekly collaborative planning specifically aligned to the remediation of standards requiring attention. I-Ready Magnetic Reading Program will be prescribed with skill sets that target the students' lowest areas of concentration through remedial lessons. On-going bi-weekly progress monitoring through reading quizzes will be carried out by the reading teacher.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiated Instructions will ensure that teachers are using a systematic approach to learning to meet the needs of the learners. Teachers will provide opportunities for students to work in small groups. Differentiated Instruction will give the teachers the opportunity to focus on skills that student needs remediation on. Boosting these skills can improve student 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.

08/14/23-09/29/23

Data chats and collaborative planning will serve to identify students and resources needed to meet student needs.

Person Responsible: Pat Collins (148693@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23-09/29/23

08/14/23-09/29/23

After analyzing student data, create groups focused on specific student needs.

Person Responsible: Pat Collins (148693@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23-09/29/23

08/14/23-09/29/23

Two standards will be identified in order to develop strategic planning and implement resources during differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Pat Collins (148693@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23-09/29/23

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

Based on the 22-23 ELA FAST PM3 assessment, only 37% of first grade students are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment. The majority of these student are ESOL levels 1 and 2.

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

Third Grade students scored below the desired score on the 22-23 ELA FAST PM3, with only 42% scoring a Level 3 or higher.

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

On the 2024 administration of the FAST PM3 Assessment, we expect to increase the percent of first grade students scoring on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment by 10 percentage points to 47% in ELA.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

On the 2024 administration of the FAST PM3 Assessment, we expect to increase the percent of third grade students scoring at a Level 3 or higher by 10 percentage points to 52% in ELA.

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 area of focus will be monitored by:

- Teacher attendance of Intervention training provided by the district
- Intervention rosters for students receiving Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 Intervention
- Interventionist and Teacher schedules
- Data trackers monitoring ongoing student progress
- Walk-throughs conducted by leadership team (Rodriguez, Arias, Collins and Munoz) during allocated Intervention time

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Rodriguez, Jacqueline, jackie@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?

Response to Intervention (Rti) is a multi-tier approach to the early identification and support of students with learning and behavior needs. Students are identified based on need for either Tier 2 or Tier 3 Intervention. This Intervention will take place above the 90 minute Reading block.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The Rti process begins with high quality instruction and universal screening of all children in the general education classroom and includes providing aligned interventions and on-going progress monitoring. Students who receive Tier 2 or/and Tier 3 intervention are targeted for remediation in specific skills. Extra practice and remediation of these week skills can improve student understanding and increase test scores.

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 |
|---|--|
| Analyze student data to determine student's need for Tier 2 or Tier 3 Intervention. Develop rosters to group students accordingly. 08/17-08/31/23 | Collins, Pat, 148693@dadeschools.net |
| Provide teachers with Intervention resources, training and additional support needed in order to implement Interventions with fidelity. 08/17-08/31/23 | Collins, Pat, 148693@dadeschools.net |
| Monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention rosters for fidelity. 09/01-10-29/23 | Collins, Pat, 148693@dadeschools.net |
| Conduct walk throughs to ensure Intervention is occurring on a daily basis with fidelity. 09/01-10/29/23 | Rodriguez, Jacqueline, jackie@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.

All Title I documents are shared with all stakeholders through various methods. At the Opening of School Meeting with staff a Title I presentation is presented. Parents and community leaders receive information about Title I through Open House, PTO and EESAC meetings.

School website: <https://pinelakeelementary.com/>

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))

Pine Lake Elementary works closely with parents and families to ensure students have a successful and safe school year. Information is disseminated to parents through PTO and EESAC meetings, Open House, monthly calendar, teacher platforms and Messenger messages. Parents can apply to be a school volunteer also.

School website: <https://pinelakeelementary.com/>

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))

N/A

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

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: Math | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction | \$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