Southside Preparatory Academy School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Southside Preparatory Academy

45 SW 13TH ST, Miami, FL 33130

http://southside.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.

Southside Preparatory Museums Magnet School is committed to providing a culturally diverse learning environment in collaboration with museums throughout the community. A humanities-based curriculum infused with museum resources and expeditions provides hands-on, minds-on authentic learning experiences taking students beyond the walls of the classroom.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Southside Preparatory Museums Magnet School is a unique and challenging museums-based learning environment, which enables students to: Explore, Examine, Experiment, and Exhibit; therefore becoming self-directed, creative, critical thinkers.

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
Tellez, Linette	Principal	Instructional Leader Organizational Leader Teacher Attendane/Retention/Evaluation Budget Parental Involvement/Support
Alvarez, Annie	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader Organizational Leader Teacher Attendane/Retention/Evaluation Parental Involvement/Support Student Attendance/Progress Monitoring Testing Chairperson Response to Intervention ESOL/SPED Compliance
Mondy, Matasha	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader Organizational Leader Teacher Attendane/Retention/Evaluation Parental Involvement/Support Student Attendance/Progress Monitoring Testing Chairperson Response to Intervention ESOL/SPED Compliance
martinez, koryna	Magnet Coordinator	Magnet Curriculum STEAM Designee Enrollment Integrated Planning Site Visits Exhibitions

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.

Prior to the development of the SIP, a teacher, parent and student survey was conducted to collect data and determine areas of strength and areas for improvement. The SIP is reviewed by all staff during faculty meetings. Any revisions, modifications or additions to action steps are made based on feedback. The SIP is then presented to EESAC members. At this time, teachers, parents and stakeholders will have an opportunity to share ideas and provide feedback to existing action steps.

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 will meet quarterly to analyze student data and progress. At this time, data driven decisions, along with administrative observations will determine effective implementation and drive next action steps. Administrators will meet with teachers and/or parents of specific students not making adequate progress to individualize a learning plan to ensure success. Teachers in need of support will be paired with a mentor to enhance instructional strategies that will better meet the needs of their learners.

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	84%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	60%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) 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: B 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	9	6	9	6	5	5	4	2	11	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	3	5	5	1	2	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	3	10	11	4	12	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	29	29	40	29	11	23	161
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	28	29	33	9	13	127
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	23	11	25	34	37	49	46	30	35	290

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	6	19	22	24	20	4	15	114

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	4	15	3	6	7	4	6	6	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	1	5	10	9	2	3	0	3	33
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	8	7	2	7	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	18	19	22	12	12	91
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	15	32	29	17	22	120
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	10	20	31	25	26	16	16	144

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	5	11	16	19	20	9	13	94

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	5	8	0	0	2	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

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	9	6	9	6	5	5	4	2	11	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	1	5	10	9	2	3	0	3	33
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	8	7	2	7	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	18	19	22	12	12	91
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	15	32	29	17	22	120
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	10	20	31	25	26	16	16	144

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	5	11	16	19	20	9	13	94

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	5	8	0	0	2	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

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*	65	61	53	66	62	55	63		
ELA Learning Gains				65			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			47		
Math Achievement*	65	63	55	61	51	42	55		
Math Learning Gains				59			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			40		
Science Achievement*	46	56	52	54	60	54	54		
Social Studies Achievement*	80	77	68	74	68	59	66		
Middle School Acceleration	56	75	70	43	61	51			
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	71	62	55	68	75	70	64		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	455
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	596
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	33	Yes	3	
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	63			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	57			

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	34	Yes	2	
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	54			
HSP	57			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	55			

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	65			65			46	80	56			71
SWD	34			42			10				4	44
ELL	56			60			49	69			6	71
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42			42							2	
HSP	63			64			42	80	54		7	71
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80			71			78				4	
FRL	59			59			41	77	43		7	60

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	66	65	52	61	59	54	54	74	43			68
SWD	36	50	33	24	40	30	27					
ELL	58	65	51	57	58	57	36	66	35			68
AMI												
ASN	82			82								
BLK	47	55		58	55							
HSP	63	64	52	58	57	54	48	73	35			68
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	89	72		82	71		95					73
FRL	59	64	47	57	58	53	45	75	31			65

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	63	59	47	55	42	40	54	66				64
SWD	28	52	42	19	48	42	30					
ELL	60	60	51	51	42	38	46	63				64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			33								
HSP	62	57	47	53	41	40	51	65				62
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80	81		75	52		80					92
FRL	56	54	45	50	38	38	48	63				62

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	57%	56%	1%	54%	3%
07	2023 - Spring	60%	50%	10%	47%	13%
08	2023 - Spring	45%	51%	-6%	47%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	58%	8%	58%	8%
06	2023 - Spring	36%	50%	-14%	47%	-11%
03	2023 - Spring	59%	52%	7%	50%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	32%	58%	-26%	54%	-22%
07	2023 - Spring	52%	48%	4%	48%	4%
03	2023 - Spring	76%	63%	13%	59%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	64%	3%	61%	6%
08	2023 - Spring	60%	59%	1%	55%	5%
05	2023 - Spring	60%	58%	2%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	7%	40%	-33%	44%	-37%
05	2023 - Spring	52%	50%	2%	51%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	56%	34%	50%	40%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	68%	6%	66%	8%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Grade 8 NGSSS Science data demonstrated 7% of students demonstrated they were on grade level. The data demonstrates the lowest performance in our school. The grade 8 Science teacher was a non-education major that was hired days prior to the opening of schools as a new teacher. Support was provided to the teacher in the content area however the delivery of instruction did not meet the students needs.

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

NGSSS Science data demonstrated that 7% of students were proficient which is a decline of 46% percentage points from the 21-22 school year. The data demonstrates the lowest performance in our school. The grade 8 Science teacher was a non-education major that was hired days prior to the opening of schools as a new teacher. Support was provided to the teacher in the content area however the delivery of instruction did not meet the students needs.

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.

FAST Grade 6 Mathematics data demonstrated 34% of students performed on grade level compared to the state average of 54 percent. Additional support was needed with planning for whole group and differentiated instruction. Students struggled with grasping math concepts during the instructional block.

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

Algebra demonstrated the greatest improvements. 90% of students taking Algebra demonstrated proficiency in the Algebra EOC and increase of 47 percentage points from the previous year. This teacher was new to the subject area however she was a previous math teacher. Students selected to take the course were identified based on their previous years scores. The teacher also provided students extended learning opportunities.

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

Attendance continues to be an area of concern, with 29% of our student population being absent more than 10 days in the school year. It is evident that in order for students to improve in all areas attending school is the main component. In order to receive the support and services needed students must report to school.

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

1. Science will be the main academic priority throughout the 23-24 school year. We will focus on student engagement strategies to ensure that students are active participants in their daily learning, which will ensure that all learning modalities are met during instructional delivery.
2. Grade 6 Math
3. Student attendance
4. Additionally, we will use data to guide all school wide decisions; instructional, social/emotional, discipline, attendance and incentives to ensure that we are meeting the needs of all stakeholders.
5. Finally, we will work with families to provide various involvement opportunities within the school site.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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

According the the 2022-2023 NGSS Science Assessment, approximately 39% of students in 5th and 8th grade were proficient in the area of Science. The 2022-2023 data shows that only 7% of 8th grade students and 52% for 5th were proficient on the NGSS Science Assessment. Based on the data, we will focus on Student Engagement because it is directly related to Science instruction, inquiry based learning and STEAM curriculum and in turn will increase student proficiency.

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 strategy of Student Engagement we expect to see a 15 percentage point increase in overall student Proficiency in the area of Science on the 2024 State Assessment. Additionally, we expect to see at least a 20% percentage point increase in 8th Grade Science.

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

The leadership team will actively participate in collaborative planning meetings to monitor for the integration of science labs and STEAM Curriculum. Additionally, they will conduct daily walk throughs to monitor for the fidelity of engagement strategies, STEAM instruction, essential labs and evidence student work products.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linette Tellez (pr5321@dadeschools.net)

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

Within the targeted element of Science, our school will focus on the evidence based strategy of student engagement. Teachers will plan for hands on learning through science labs and STEAM projects which will directly align with grade level standards. Students will show evidence of mastering the lesson objectives through their work samples and assessment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The implementation of the evidence based strategy of Student Engagement will provide students the opportunity to master standards through the use of hands on learning which will target all learning modalities. Teachers will explicitly deliver planned lessons and guide the students through the various steps in labs, STEAM projects and independent work. Students will show evidence of mastering the standard through end products, lab sheets and assessments.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Implementation of a designated Science Lab and schedule with sufficient materials to conduct essential labs. As a result, this will assist in the implementation and fidelity of conducting essential labs.

Person Responsible: Linette Tellez (pr5321@dadeschools.net)

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

Teachers will meet for collaborative planning to plan for the implementation of hands on learning through essential labs and STEAM activities. As a result, lessons and end products that are directly correlated to science standards and STEAM objectives will be used to engage students in the learning process.

Person Responsible: koryna martinez (msmartinez@dadeschools.net)

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

Provide teachers with professional development focused on STEAM scope and sequence, engagement strategies, lessons and student artifacts. As a result, there will be increased knowledge of STEAM objectives and criteria in order to effectively integrate STEAM Curriculum.

Person Responsible: koryna martinez (msmartinez@dadeschools.net)

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned 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 the the 2022-2023 FAST Assessment, approximately 63% of students in grades 3-8 were proficient in the area of Reading and 64% of students in grades 3-8 were proficient in the area of Math. Based on the data, we will focus on benchmark aligned instruction through data driven decision making to increase student proficiency.

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 strategy of benchmark-aligned instruction we expect to see a 5 percentage point increase in student Proficiency in the area of Reading and Math on the 2024 FAST State Assessment.

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

The Leadership Team will meet monthly to analyze and monitor teacher and student data (Progress Monitoring, Topic Assessments, Bi-weekly Assessments and IReady data will be tracked) Additionally, weekly walk throughs will be conducted to monitor for explicit instruction, and the analysis of student work to align with benchmark-aligned instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Annie Alvarez (anniealvarez@dadeschools.net)

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

Within the targeted element of benchmark aligned instruction, our school will focus on the evidence based strategy of data driven decision making. Teachers will execute lessons based on benchmarks and ensure that student work directly aligns to the intended grade level standard.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The implementation of data driven decision making will ensure that data is used at every level to make informed decisions on what is best for students. The Leadership team and teachers will use data to determine goals, interventions, extended learning opportunities, RTI and teacher support. Teachers will explicitly deliver lessons that are benchmark aligned to guide students to mastery. Students will show mastery of lesson objectives through their work products and/or assessments.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will use district developed pacing guides and resources to plan for benchmark aligned instruction. As a result, lesson plans and student work products will be aligned to standards.

Person Responsible: Linette Tellez (pr5321@dadeschools.net)

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

Teachers and Administrators will monitor and track student data and work products to determine the need for reteaching, remediation, differentiated instruction and/or next steps. As a result, ongoing checkpoints will determine if instruction was explicit, aligned to benchmarks, and mastered by students.

Person Responsible: Annie Alvarez (anniealvarez@dadeschools.net)

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

Administrators will conduct daily walk throughs focusing on benchmark aligned instruction, questioning and student work samples. As a result, teachers in need of additional support will be provided with a mentor teacher or colleague that will assist in the development of lesson plans, goals and desired student outcomes.

Person Responsible: Linette Tellez (pr5321@dadeschools.net)

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

#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.

According to the 2022-2023 Staff Climate Survey, approximately 50% of teachers state that they feel supported by parents. We decided to focus on Family Engagement to increase parental involvement in the school, class and their child's educational journey. This will have a direct impact on a student's academic and social/emotional progress.

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

If we focus on Family Engagement, we will increase teacher's feelings of parental support by 10% as indicated on the 2023-2023 Staff Climate Survey.

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

The Leadership Team will meet quarterly to assess the effectiveness Family Engagement opportunities through PTA meetings, teachers feedback and parent attendance at events.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linette Tellez (pr5321@dadeschools.net)

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

Within the Targeted Element of a Positive School Culture and Environment, our school will focus on Family Engagement. By hosting monthly events for families, we are providing various opportunities for all families to be involved, thus creating genuine and collaborative relationships, integrating staff and families thus resulting in student growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If we increase Family Engagement within our school, teachers will feel more supported by parents with academics, discipline and the social/emotional well being of students. Additionally, parents will feel like they are not only welcome in our school, but an integral part of the educational journey of their child, resulting in higher parent satisfaction. Finally, by providing a range of activities/opportunities for families to participate allows for different families to have different capacities for involvement that suits their needs. This will result in a larger percent of families to be involved.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Leadership Team, PTA and selected staff members will meet to plan for Family Engagement events for the first semester. As a result, events will be planned and organized in a timely manner, duties will be outlined and goals will be set.

Person Responsible: Linette Tellez (pr5321@dadeschools.net)

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

A system for documenting parental attendance and feedback will be created. As a result, we will know if parental needs are being met through events being organized.

Person Responsible: koryna martinez (msmartinez@dadeschools.net)

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

Social Media platforms will be utilized to advertise events, showcase events and promote the participation of all families. As a result, we hope to increase parental participation at each event.

Person Responsible: koryna martinez (msmartinez@dadeschools.net)

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

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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 the the 2022-2023 FAST Assessment, approximately 29% of SWD students in grades 3-8 were proficient in the area of Reading, 38% were proficient in the area of Math and 5% in the area of Science. Based on the data, we will focus on differentiated instruction to increase student proficiency.

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

If teachers with SWD students implement Differentiated Instruction with the support of the SWD teacher within ELA, Math and Science, then students in grades 3-8 will increase proficiency by 5% points across all subject areas.

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

Administration will conduct weekly walk throughs to ensure that the general education teacher and SWD teacher are working collaboratively to implement Differentiated Instruction with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matasha Mondy (mmondy@dadeschools.net)

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

Within the targeted element of the SWD subgroup, our school will focus on the evidence based strategy of Differentiated Instruction. Teachers will plan with support personnel, create weekly rotations and plan for specific students needs during small group instruction. Evidence will be demonstrated through student work samples and assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Through the implementation of Differentiated Instruction, teachers will plan to address specific learner needs and/or academic gaps through various avenues to learning. Differentiated Instruction proves to have positive impacts in a wide range of students, thus resulting in increase student achievement.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

SWD ELA & Math teachers will meet with the administrators to analyze student historical data. As a result, teachers will develop initial student placement for small groups.

Person Responsible: Matasha Mondy (mmondy@dadeschools.net)

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

SWD ELA & Math teachers will meet weekly for collaborative planning to gather resources, share best practices and plan for small group instruction. As a result, teachers will work together to develop small group plans that best meet the needs of their students.

Person Responsible: Matasha Mondy (mmondy@dadeschools.net)

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

Administrators will conduct weekly walk throughs to monitor for the implementation of small group instruction. This will ensure that Differentiated Instruction is done with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Matasha Mondy (mmondy@dadeschools.net)

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

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Additional funding is not allocated from local, state or federal entities. School principal will allocate funds to hire additional intervention support personnel to assist with small group instruction. Support personnel will work with students in Reading and Math classrooms who meet ESSA criteria. District prescribed resources will be used to remediate deficient standards, bridge learning gaps and accelerate instruction. With the assistance of interventionist personnel, students will regularly meet in small groups for additional support.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$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