

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Jane S. Roberts K 8 Center 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

Jane S. Roberts K 8 Center

14850 COTTONWOOD CIR, Miami, FL 33185

<http://jsr.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.

Jane S. Roberts K-8 center enriches the community through educational excellence and continued commitment and support of our teachers, staff, students, families, and the community that we serve. The extension of the services that the school provides encompasses the needs of the whole individual and ensures academic, social, and personal growth within a supportive, creative, and flexible environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Jane S. Roberts K-8 Center holds the following beliefs that all educational endeavors undertaken by the school ideally develop and align a positive school image through the advancement of the academic, social, and personal well being of the student body.

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
Martinez, Diony	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.
Loriga, Vivian	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal supports instructional leaders, engages, and collaborates with stakeholders, leads data analysis, and facilitates professional development.
Guzman, Natalia	School Counselor	Ms. Guzman provides social emotional support to students at Jane S. Roberts K-8 Center in grades K-5.
Garcia, Lourdes	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies classroom instructor and curriculum chairperson. EESAC Chairperson who oversees meetings, agendas, and scheduling.
Sanchez, Joanna	Teacher, K-12	Media Specialist, Gifted chairperson, testing support. Ms. Sanchez supports the leadership team by participating in meetings, providing curriculum support, and providing media center services to all students at JSR.
Andrade, Michelle	School Counselor	Ms. Andrade provides social emotional support to students at Jane S. Roberts K-8 Center in grades 6-8.

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.

Developing a SIP is a collaborative process that involves working with a number of stakeholders. To collaborate with teachers and staff, we utilize survey data and involve teachers from select departments and/or grade levels to assist in SIP development. We review survey and assessment data with teachers in order to create SIP targets and strategies that specifically focus on areas which are in need of improvement. To involve parents, students, families, community members, and business leaders, we work with our EESAC. We present what teachers and school leaders collaborate to input into the SIP and provide opportunities for EESAC to provide input and approval.

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))

Monitoring the School Improvement Plan (SIP) for effective implementation and impact on increasing student achievement, especially for students with the greatest achievement gap, involves several key steps. We will use data collection and analysis to provide progress monitoring information as well as targets for goals. We reflect upon the collected data to identify areas of strength and weakness so we can alter our SIP throughout the year to continually meet the goals set in place. The leadership team and select teacher leaders meet at various points throughout the school year to complete these reflections and advise on revisions for the SIP.

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)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	95%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	66%
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) 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	12	6	1	5	3	4	5	13	11	60	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	19	2	0	8	0	0	0	29	
Course failure in Math	0	0	11	4	0	6	0	3	0	24	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	2	20	18	19	31	104	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	5	35	15	7	25	92	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	6	34	28	16	46	50	61	83	332	

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	13	10	1	24	14	9	18	90	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	9	7	0	0	0	1	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	5	6	6	4	3	6	7	4	11	52	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	4	1	0	2	1	1	13	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	3	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	2	6	9	2	13	35	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	6	3	22	8	10	52	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	5	8	3	2	6	9	2	13	50	

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	3	4	2	2	13	5	9	38

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	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	5	6	6	4	3	6	7	4	11	52	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	4	1	0	2	1	1	13	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	3	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	2	6	9	2	13	35	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	6	3	22	8	10	52	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	5	8	3	2	6	9	2	13	50	

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	3	4	2	2	13	5	9	38

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	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*	69	61	53	74	62	55	74		
ELA Learning Gains				66			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60			49		
Math Achievement*	73	63	55	68	51	42	62		
Math Learning Gains				71			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68			37		
Science Achievement*	54	56	52	54	60	54	57		
Social Studies Achievement*	76	77	68	68	68	59	67		
Middle School Acceleration	62	75	70	81	61	51	55		
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	67	62	55	82	75	70	37		

* 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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	475
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	692
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	1	
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	68			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	69			

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%
FRL	61			

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	51			
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	69			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	68			

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	69			73			54	76	62			67
SWD	32			44			21	36			6	60
ELL	64			71			41	81			6	67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	70			74			53	76	62		7	67
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT	63			63			80				3	
FRL	61			71			45	70	45		7	69

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	74	66	60	68	71	68	54	68	81			82
SWD	43	52	51	33	66	67	28	35				80
ELL	68	65	55	66	70	67	36	65				82
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	73	66	60	68	70	67	53	67	80			82
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75	74		67	89							
FRL	72	65	61	67	71	68	49	65	84			80

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	74	59	49	62	37	37	57	67	55			37
SWD	44	46	42	32	34	38	43	46	30			18
ELL	72	63	64	58	35	36	61	59				37
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	73	59	51	61	38	38	58	64	54			37
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	84	60		71	32							
FRL	72	60	49	59	37	39	54	70	53			38

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	66%	56%	10%	54%	12%
07	2023 - Spring	64%	50%	14%	47%	17%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	51%	3%	47%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	58%	23%	58%	23%
06	2023 - Spring	65%	50%	15%	47%	18%
03	2023 - Spring	68%	52%	16%	50%	18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	74%	58%	16%	54%	20%
07	2023 - Spring	79%	48%	31%	48%	31%
03	2023 - Spring	81%	63%	18%	59%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	64%	21%	61%	24%
08	2023 - Spring	69%	59%	10%	55%	14%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	58%	-5%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	48%	40%	8%	44%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	50%	3%	51%	2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	56%	38%	50%	44%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	48%	*

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	65%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	68%	5%	66%	7%

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.

Statewide Science Assessment proficiency scores continually trend in 50% - 60% proficiency rates. In the 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 school year 5th and 8th grade science collectively scored 54% proficiency, with a drop in general education and ESE student proficiency scores from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023. Science must be closely examined and changes must be made to teaching methodologies, classroom strategies, and data analysis and discussions between teachers and administrators and teachers and students.

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

ELA proficiency showed the greatest decline, going from 74% proficient in 2021-2022 to 70% proficient in 2022-2023. Possible contributing factors are a larger focus that was placed on mathematics this school year to raise mathematics proficiency at JSR and the continuing struggle to catch students up in ELA as they continue to make up for the effects of the pandemic.

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

Both ELA and Mathematics proficiency showed a 20 percentage point positive difference from state averages. Jane S. Roberts K-8 attained 70% proficiency in ELA, while the state average was 50%, and attained 76% proficiency in Mathematics, while the state average was 56%. A likely factor attributing to our success rate is a continual use of data analysis and usage. At the classroom level, teachers meet with students to analyze their data and set goals, as well as re-visit and revise goals and strategies

throughout the school year. At the administrative level, administrators meet with teachers to analyze data and set goals, as well as re-visit collected data throughout the school year to ensure all individual students are receiving instruction that best suits their academic needs. Finally, our data trends typically show strength in ELA and Mathematics, therefore a healthy assumption would be for that data to continue to trend as a strength.

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

Civics and mathematics proficiency both showed an eight percentage point increase from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023 scores. The mathematics gain is attributed to a focus on mathematics proficiency that was targeted with data chats, selective before and after school tutoring groups, and ensuring teachers were adequately trained to utilize the new mathematics series. The civics increase is attributed to district support that was provided to our civics department, data chats, and incentives for students exhibiting proficiency on mini and mid year assessments.

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

Attendance is an area in which Jane S. Roberts K-8 Center can improve upon. Our data trends show that over the last three years the percentage of students with 16-30 absences has increased by four percentage points, while our percentage of students with 0-5 absences has decreased fifteen percentage points. It is very likely that decreasing the amount students with excessive absences will result in higher overall proficiency rates and adequate learning gains in the 2023-2024 school year.

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

The highest priorities for school improvement at Jane S. Roberts K-8 Center for the 2023-2024 school year, beginning with the most important, is overall science proficiency, ELA proficiency, learning gains, and attendance.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Attendance is an area in which Jane S. Roberts K-8 Center (JSR) will focus on in the 2023-2024 school year. According to JSR Early Warning Systems (EWS) data trends, it is evident that over the last three years the percentage of students with 16-30 absences has increased by four percentage points, while our percentage of students with 0-5 absences has decreased fifteen percentage points. It is very likely that decreasing the amount students with excessive absences will result in higher overall proficiency rates and adequate learning gains in the 2023-2024 school year. We will implement the attendance initiatives strategy to aid us in meeting this goal.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of attendance initiatives intervention strategies, such as attendance incentive programs/celebrations, improved communication with families, and consequences for excessive absences, we aim to achieve a five percentage point reduction in students with 16-30 absences for the 2023-2024 school year. This will be evident in our attendance data at the end of the mentioned school year.

Monitoring:

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

The assistant principal and both elementary and middle school counselors will collaborate to monitor attendance data on a monthly basis. This attendance team will conduct meetings with students and/or parents to address attendance concerns in a proactive manner. Meetings with parents will provide opportunities for parents to make note of concerns, express solutions, and collaborate with the school to improve their child's attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diony Martinez (pr4691@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence based strategy of attendance initiatives provides close monitoring and reporting of student absences, communication with parents, direct home visits if/when necessary, counseling, outside resources, and incentives.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A three year data trend at Jane S. Roberts K-8 shows increasing numbers of students falling into the 16-30 absences category in the EWI'S. There has been a four percentage point increase in the past three years in the 16-30 absences category. Absences have a direct impact on a student's ability to learn and build knowledge, therefore this is an important area of focus and utilizing the strategy of attendance initiatives, with fidelity, will result in a decrease of students with excessive absences. Improving attendance will support academic goals and improve assessment scores due to students receiving the most instructional hours possible.

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.

The attendance team will complete monthly attendance monitoring and report to regional and/or district offices. As a result, attendance monitoring will be consistent throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Michelle Andrade (m.andrade@dadeschools.net)

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

Loss of activities and/or ability to maintain membership in school clubs and sports will be enforced for students exhibiting excessive absences. As a result, students will show improved attendance.

Person Responsible: Diony Martinez (pr4691@dadeschools.net)

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

Administrators will address students in grades three through eight to discuss attendance expectations, incentives, and consequences of poor attendance. Students will, as a result, understand attendance expectations in a clear manner.

Person Responsible: Michelle Andrade (m.andrade@dadeschools.net)

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

Counselors and PTSA will collaborate to provide quarterly attendance incentives for students.

Person Responsible: Natalia Guzman (n.guzman@dadeschools.net)

By When: 10/16/23 - 1/19/24

Students with 5 or more tardy notations will be excluded from an extracurricular event.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: 10/16/23 - 1/19/24

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**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.

Intervention was identified as an area of critical need. According to a comparison of the 2022 to the 2023 ELA State Assessment, the data reflected that our proficiency decreased by four percentage points. In 2022, we achieved a 74% proficiency rate in ELA, while in 2023, we decreased to a 70% proficiency rate in ELA. Intervention is critical to appropriately addressing the instructional needs of all learners. The school's goal is to raise our ELA proficiency from 70% to 72%, should be achieved through the use of targeted intervention throughout the school year. We will implement the intervention to aid us in meeting this goal.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement ELA intervention, then our ELA proficiency will increase from 70% to 72%, as measured by the ELA Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) scores.

Monitoring:

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

The administration will employ collaborative planning, walk-throughs, and data discussions to actively oversee the organization, execution, and integration of intervention. Student progress data will be thoroughly examined during Leadership Team meetings and administrator to teacher data chats to verify students' advancement and to pinpoint those who require intervention or a change in intervention placement. This comprehensive monitoring approach aims to ensure continuous growth and provide additional support to students as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diony Martinez (pr4691@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence based intervention strategy that was selected to support this focus is intervention. Intervention is a strategy used to teach a new skill, build fluency in a skill, or encourage a child to apply an existing skill to new situations or settings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The data reflects a four percentage point drop in ELA proficiency from 2022 to 2023, therefore the evidence based strategy of intervention was selected because it provides the opportunity to analyze data and target students needs with individualized educational strategies.

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.

The administration will employ data discussions to actively oversee the organization, execution, and integration of intervention. Student progress data will be thoroughly examined during Leadership Team meetings and administrator to teacher data chats to verify students' advancement and to pinpoint those who require intervention or a change in intervention placement. This comprehensive monitoring approach aims to ensure continuous growth and provide additional support to students as needed.

Person Responsible: Diony Martinez (pr4691@dadeschools.net)

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

Professional Development relating to Wonders intervention will be provided to applicable teachers prior to the first day of the 2023 school year. As a result, all teachers who provide intervention will be well versed in the Wonders intervention program and be able to begin intervention correctly and in a timely fashion.

Person Responsible: Joanna Sanchez (joannasanchez@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/16/23

To facilitate teachers' understanding and utilization of the intervention materials, comprehensive support and resources will be provided to teachers, by administration. This will enable teachers to effectively incorporate the recommended and proven resources into their intervention practices.

Person Responsible: Vivian Loriga (259361@dadeschools.net)

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

Conduct data chats with teachers to review their intervention students' performance data from the 2023 FSA ELA testing, as well as their most recent i-Ready diagnostic data. As a result, teachers will be aware of individual student needs to be focused on during intervention.

Person Responsible: Vivian Loriga (vivloriga@dadeschools.net)

By When: 10/23/23

Intervention data will be used to support retention processes for students and/or RFA's for students.

Person Responsible: Vivian Loriga (vivloriga@dadeschools.net)

By When: 10/16/23-1/19/24

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

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

Science proficiency was identified as an area of need based. According to a comparison of the 2022 to the 2023 Science State Assessment data, it is evident that our proficiency remained at the same rate. In both 2022 and 2023, we achieved a 54% proficiency rate in the Science State Assessment. Our goal is to increase the Science proficiency rate from 54% to 60%. We will implement the instructional support and coaching intervention strategy to aid us in meeting this goal.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement the instructional support and coaching intervention strategy, then our Science proficiency will increase from 54% to 60%, as measured by PM 3 of the ELA Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) scores.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators will ensure that fifth and eighth grade science teachers are provided push in support on a weekly basis by a science coach and that teachers are utilizing collaborative planning to create effective lessons that target science proficiency. Administrators will monitor science topic assessment scores and meet with teachers on a monthly basis to review data together in order for teachers to modify instruction as necessary, adjust science intervention groups as necessary, and for teachers to target re-teach lessons to the appropriate students. Teachers will meet with students on a quarterly basis to review their data with them to provide insights into their areas of strengths and weaknesses, as well as inform them of their progress. This data driven monitoring technique will provide guidance, support, and targets for improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vivian Loriga (259361@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.)

We will employ the instructional support and coaching strategy because teachers work together to set a measurable goal to improve instructional outcomes and are provided coaching cycles focused on the identified goal and increasing the achievement and engagement of every student by bringing out the best performance of every teacher. Coaches use both student-centered and teacher-centered methods to help teachers improve the decisions they make about their instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Upon reviewing the 2022 to 2023 NGSSS data, a stagnant score of 54% proficiency was seen. In order to raise proficiency and pull away from this trend, instructional support and coaching was selected. This strategy was selected because this is a strategy that provides an opportunity for teachers to be coached and supported in many ways They can participate in coaching cycles, team coaching, and have access to push in support by a science coach. All of these mini strategies that fall under instructional support and coaching will result in an increase in proficiency on the 2024 NGSSS.

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.

Administrators will meet with science teachers initially to discuss science proficiency goals and provide the framework for improvement. As a result, science teachers will understand the importance of raising science proficiency rates and be prepared to target science in the 2023-2024 school year.

Person Responsible: Diony Martinez (pr4691@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/16/23

Administrators will conduct science topic assessment data chats with all science teachers to provide guidance in re-teach lessons and begin identifying students for science intervention groups (to begin later in the school year). As a result, teachers will employ data driven science re-teach lessons to students who require it.

Person Responsible: Vivian Loriga (259361@dadeschools.net)

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

Push in support will be utilized on a weekly basis where a science coach enters the classroom to support the science teacher by conducting small group re-teaches based on Topic Assessment data.

Person Responsible: Joanna Sanchez (joannasanchez@dadeschools.net)

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

Administration will work with the district science department to provide support for Jane S. Roberts K-8 science teachers.

Person Responsible: Diony Martinez (pr4691@dadeschools.net)

By When: 10/16/23 - 1/19/24

Administration will provide incentives for students achieving proficiency on topic assessments.

Person Responsible: Vivian Loriga (vivloriga@dadeschools.net)

By When: 10/16/23 - 1/19/24

#4. 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 2021-2022 Science NGSSS and the 2022-2023 Science NGSSS, our student proficiency remained the same at 54%. A comparison of the 2021-2022 FSA data and the 2022-2023 FAST PMS, ELA proficiency showed a four percentage point drop, going from 74% to 70%. Both of these data points warrant a form of intervention in order to raise proficiency, as well as address ELA learning gains. We will focus on collaborative planning throughout the school, though with a special focus on ELA and science teachers in order for them to work together to infuse science skills/topics during reading instruction to improve comprehension skills and science application in a simultaneous fashion. As a result, ELA and Science proficiency will increase, and ELA will show learning gains.

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 while using collaborative data chats and the infusion of science skills/topics during reading instruction, then comprehension skills of informational text will evidence growth, which will positively impact ELA by increasing proficiency from 70% to 72%, and showing learning gains in the L25 group, as measured by the 2024 ELA FAST PM 3 and science by increasing proficiency from 54% to 60% as measured by the 2024 Science NGSSS.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators will visit collaborative planning sessions once a month and conduct classroom walkthroughs to gauge implementation and effectiveness of collaborative planning. Administrators will also review various data points with teachers on a quarterly basis; data to be reviewed will include, but will not be limited to, FAST PM 1 – PM 3, bi weekly assessments, unit assessments, topic assessments, and i-Ready diagnostics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diony Martinez (pr4691@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence based strategy that we have selected to employ in the support of collaborative planning is collaborative data chats. During collaborative data chats, teachers, support staff, and administration analyze student performance data and determine how that information will be used to drive future instruction. Time is also allotted to discuss activities and strategies teachers have used to remediate and/or enrich students on the assessed standards. Data chats are also a time to discuss teacher needs as it relates to additional assistance needed in the classroom, and in what ways both administration and support staff can assist teachers with those needs and support collaborative planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Due to a data analysis that revealed our science proficiency remaining the same, at 54% proficiency performance on the 2021-2022 Science NGSSS and the 2022-2023 Science NGSSS, as well as an ELA proficiency decrease of four percentage points from 74% in 2021-2022 to 70% in 2022-2023, we selected collaborative data chats as a strategy to address these areas of need. Through the use of consistent collaborative data chats, we will be able to effectively track data together and use it to alter lesson plans

and instruction to meet ongoing student needs throughout the school year, which will result in proficiency increases in ELA and science.

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.

Administration will provide teacher schedules that accommodate collaborative planning amongst grade level and/or department teachers. This will result in teachers having adequate time to plan together.

Person Responsible: Diony Martinez (pr4691@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/18/2023

Grade level and/or department teachers will meet to collaboratively plan on a bi-weekly basis. This will result in collegiate sharing, planning, and data use.

Person Responsible: Vivian Loriga (259361@dadeschools.net)

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

Administrators will meet with all teachers by grade level or department to provide initial data and discuss how to use the data in collaborative planning. This will result in data driven instruction across the grade level and/or department.

Person Responsible: Diony Martinez (pr4691@dadeschools.net)

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

Departmentalized teachers will meet to collaboratively plan to integrate science skills and topics into ELA lessons and reading comprehension in order to build science knowledge and informational comprehension abilities in students.

Person Responsible: Diony Martinez (pr4691@dadeschools.net)

By When: 10/16/23 - 1/19/24

Administration will provide PD pertaining to effective collaborative planning.

Person Responsible: Vivian Loriga (vivloriga@dadeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23