

2023-24 Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| SIP Authority and Purpose I. School Information II. Needs Assessment/Data Review III. Planning for Improvement IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 3 |
|--|----|
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 11 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 25 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 25 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 27 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 28 |

Springview Elementary School

1122 BLUEBIRD AVE, Miami Springs, FL 33166

http://svelem.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), <u>https://www.floridacims.org</u>, 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.

Springview Elementary is committed to developing the physical and mental well-being of all stakeholders and creating lifelong learners in a climate of excellence through school, family and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The staff and community at Springview Elementary School is committed to the belief that all children should be encouraged to grow, learn and become productive members of society through involvement in a continuous progression of meaningful learning experiences that incorporates the physical and mental well-being of all stakeholders. We believe that our school's purpose is to challenge all students to apply high levels of critical and creative thinking through ongoing academic and social growth. The staff and parents accept and share responsibility for personal, academic, and social growth as well as, positive participation in the learning process of their children.

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 |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Flor, Catalina | Principal | Manage the physical, financial, and human resources of the school. Build an effective school-community partnership. Become informed and effective change agents. Understand the interpretation and application of data to drive school improvement. Provide instructional leadership to increase the quality of teaching and learning at the school site. Provide vision and leadership to foster a culture of high expectations for all students. Become part of a professional community of practice. Provide a model of strong instructional leadership capable of transforming school cultures. |
| Gomez- Lugo, Irene | Assistant Principal | Assist the Principal with: Manage the physical, financial, and human resources of the school. Build an effective school-community partnership. Become informed and effective change agents. Understand the interpretation and application of data to drive school improvement. Provide instructional leadership to increase the quality of teaching and learning at the school site. Provide vision and leadership to foster a culture of high expectations for all students. Become part of a professional community of practice. Provide a model of strong instructional leadership capable of transforming school cultures. |
| Castro- Hernandez, Sylvia | Instructional Technology | Manage the physical and financial resources of the media center whose duties include coordination of deliveries with service providers, communicate with site based technician regarding repair issues, oversee the distribution of devices and manage the circulation and inventory of devices to teachers and students through the ATMS system. Additional responsibilities are United Way Representative, school site Reading Contact, I-Ready and Cambridge Facilitator, and assist with the School Improvement Plan. |
| Jimenez, Tania | Teacher, K-12 | PD Liaison, proposes professional development activities for the school, Fourth Grade ELA and Science teacher, Fourth Grade Chairperson and assists with the writing and monitoring of the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. |
| Vizcaino, Jill | Teacher, K-12 | Second Grade teacher, Gifted Chair, EESAC Chairperson, Substitute Locator, PTA Teacher Representative and assists with the writing and Implementation of the School Improvement Plan. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Storr, Gayla | Teacher, K-12 | Second Grade Teacher and Chairperson, Gradebook Manager, Peace Path Champion Member and assists with the writing and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. |
| | | |
| Pimentel, Ana | School Counselor | Elementary School Counselor |

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.

A team of teacher leaders, UTD steward, the EESAC Chair and parents was created to ensure that there would be equitable representation of all stakeholders at Springview Elementary School. During data analysis sessions to develop the areas of focus for our school, all stakeholders had the opportunity to share their concerns for both the academic needs and cultural climate of our school in order to hone in on the areas of focus and targeted elements for the SIP.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards. Through the use of data-driven instruction, teachers will use relevant, recent, and aligned methods of instruction customized to student skill areas of need. Teachers will continue to use student data chats to adjust groups and instruction based on the most current data in real time. Regular walkthroughs by instructional leaders and administration will continue to ensure that quality instruction and differentiation is taking place. Additionally, extended learning (before, during, and after school) opportunities will also be provided for students who are not showing growth.

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 | Elementary School |
| (per MSID File) Primary Service Type | PK-5 |
| (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 96% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 69% |

| 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 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|-------|--|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

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 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|--|--|
| indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|--|--|
| Indicator | к | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total | | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|--|--|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | | |

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

| Indiantar | | | Total | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---|-------|------|------------|------|---|---------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| The number of students identified retained: | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | (| Grad | de L | evel | | | | T () |
| Indicator | к | 1 | | | de Lo 4 | | | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Indicator Retained Students: Current Year | к 0 | | | 3 | 4 | | | 7 0 | 8 0 | Total 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 | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|--|--|
| indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|-------|
| muicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | TOLAI |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| The number of students identified retained: | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indiantar | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | - |
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| | | | _ | 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 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| Accountability Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 78 | 60 | 53 | 85 | 62 | 56 | 82 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 73 | | | 69 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 48 | | | 50 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 89 | 66 | 59 | 88 | 58 | 50 | 68 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 84 | | | 48 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 81 | | | 25 | | |

| Accountability Component | | 2023 | | | 2022 | | 2021 | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| Accountability Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement* | 84 | 58 | 54 | 77 | 64 | 59 | 73 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 71 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 63 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 53 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 55 | 63 | 59 | 78 | | | 52 | | |

* 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 | 76 | | | | | |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No | | | | | |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 | | | | | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 380 | | | | | |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 | | | | | |
| Percent Tested | 99 | | | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | | | | | | |
|--|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A | | | | | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 77 | | | | | |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No | | | | | |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 | | | | | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 614 | | | | | |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 | | | | | |
| Percent Tested | 100 | | | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| | | 2022-23 ES | SA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMAR | RY |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 55 | | | |
| ELL | 62 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 76 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 73 | | | |

| | | 2021-22 ES | SA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMAF | RY |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| 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 | 63 | | | |
| ELL | 77 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 75 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 100 | | | |
| FRL | 78 | | | |

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)

| | | | 2022-2 | 3 ACCOU | NTABILIT | | NENTS BY | SUBGRO | UPS | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| 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 | 78 | | | 89 | | | 84 | | | | | 55 |
| SWD | 41 | | | 53 | | | | | | | 3 | 70 |
| ELL | 64 | | | 73 | | | 64 | | | | 5 | 55 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 78 | | | 88 | | | 82 | | | | 5 | 55 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 68 | | | 88 | | | 85 | | | | 5 | 60 |

| | | | 2021-2 | 2 ACCOU | NTABILIT | у сомроі | NENTS BY | SUBGRO | UPS | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| 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 | 85 | 73 | 48 | 88 | 84 | 81 | 77 | | | | | 78 |
| SWD | 56 | 60 | | 63 | 73 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 72 | 57 | | 76 | 90 | 91 | | | | | | 78 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 84 | 71 | 45 | 86 | 83 | 81 | 73 | | | | | 78 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 100 | | | 100 | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 82 | 72 | 50 | 85 | 87 | 93 | 75 | | | | | 76 |

| | 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 | 82 | 69 | 50 | 68 | 48 | 25 | 73 | | | | | 52 | |
| SWD | 46 | 40 | | 46 | 40 | | 30 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 72 | | | 50 | | | | | | | | 52 | |

| | | | 2020-2 | 1 ACCOU | NTABILIT | | NENTS BY | SUBGRO | UPS | | | |
|-----------|-------------|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| 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 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 80 | 66 | 50 | 66 | 48 | 25 | 71 | | | | | 52 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 100 | | | 91 | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 76 | 68 | 60 | 58 | 50 | | 59 | | | | | 50 |

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 | 78% | 56% | 22% | 54% | 24% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 66% | 58% | 8% | 58% | 8% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 72% | 52% | 20% | 50% | 22% |

| МАТН | | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 81% | 63% | 18% | 59% | 22% | |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 85% | 64% | 21% | 61% | 24% | |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 83% | 58% | 25% | 55% | 28% | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 78% | 50% | 28% | 51% | 27% | | |

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.

Based on the 2022-2023 FAST ELA PM3 Data, the reading data for grade 3 ELA demonstrated the lowest performance component with 74% proficiency.

The main contributing factor in the decline of ELA data is the large amount of non-English speaking students that registered throughout the school year. In addition, the FAST ELA assessment was a new test with new standards. The test passages were lengthy and the students lack stamina.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year is grade 3 ELA. Grade 3 ELA went from 78% proficiency to 74% proficiency.

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 school's 5th grade FAST Math score is at 90% proficiency compared to the state at 55% proficiency. This is a 35 point increase compared to the state; therefore, this is the greatest gap.

Contributing factors include a supplemental teacher that assisted during Math small group instruction daily, as well as, extended learning opportunities.

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

The area demonstrating the most improvement is 3-5th grade Math proficiency. 3rd grade increased from 64% proficiency to 82% proficiency, 4th grade increased from 69% proficiency to 93% proficiency, 5th grade increased from 66% proficiency to 90% proficiency.

We provided after school tutorial, Push In support and DI.

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

Based on the data in the PowerBI attendance report, our school will implement the targeted element of student attendance with 10 or more absences. The overall attendance during the 2022-2023 school year reflected 99.68%. Through our data review, we noticed the selected students who struggle with daily attendance are also the students who are not meeting expectations for learning gains as well as proficiency.

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

- 1. Increase ELA 3rd grade proficiency scores
- 2. Increase participation in Teacher Leadership Roles
- 3. Increase the lack of parental involvement for select students according to climate survey

- 4. Hire an ART teacher as currently there are no applicants available
- 5. Increase student Enrollment

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

According to the 2022-2023 FAST PM3 data, 74% of 3rd grade students were proficient in ELA as compared to the state average of 50% and district average of 63%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors - high number of ESOL Levels 1 and 2 students and student readiness levels limiting the ability to master grade level tasks, we will implement the Targeted Element of Instructional Coaching/ Professional Learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of scaffolding, a 2% increase in proficiency of the 3rd grade ELA will increase to 76% by June 2024 on the FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team will conduct data chats quarterly, adjust groups based on current data in real time, and follow-up with regular walkthroughs to ensure quality instruction is taking place. Administrators will review lesson plans for indication of differentiation for students. Teacher will conduct Data Analysis of formative assessments of L25 students, this will be reviewed monthly to observe progress. This data will be analyzed during Leadership Team meetings to ensure students are demonstrating growth on remedial standards. Extended learning opportunities will be provided to those students who are not showing growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catalina Flor (pr5361@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 Instructional Practice related to Small Group Instruction in ELA, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Data-Driven Instruction. Data-Driven instruction will assist in accelerating the learning gains of our 3rd graders as it is a systematic approach of instruction to meet the students' needs. Data-Driven instruction will be monitored through reports in Power BI to drive instructional planning and data driven conversations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data-Driven Instruction will ensure that teachers are using relevant, recent, and aligned data to plan lessons that are customized to student needs. Teachers will continually make adjustments to their instruction, plans, and instructional delivery as new data becomes available.

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.

i-Ready representative will conduct training and provide support to all K-5 Grade teachers in order to review AP1 and AP2 data. The i-Ready toolkit will be provided as an additional resource to enhance data driven instruction targeting specific deficiencies. i-Ready will also provide support to teachers in order to desegregate data after AP1 to guide teachers on assigning individual student lessons and guide small group instruction. The first i-Ready data chat will be on 10-13-23.

Person Responsible: Catalina Flor (pr5361@dadeschools.net)

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

Teachers will attend District professional development, which will allow each grade level/department to share best practices through digital platforms during 08/14/23-9/29/23. Teachers will utilize best practices for small group instruction and data driven instruction.

Person Responsible: Catalina Flor (pr5361@dadeschools.net)

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

Teachers will have the opportunity to attend monthly ICAD meetings for ELA during 08/14/23-9/29/23. Teachers will utilize best practices for small group instruction and data driven instruction.

Person Responsible: Catalina Flor (pr5361@dadeschools.net)

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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, 74% of grade 3 students, 86% of grade 4 students and 86% of grade 5 students with a grade 3 through 5 average of 82% were proficient in ELA as compared to the District average of 63% of students proficient base on the data and the identified contributing factors of: high number of ESOL level 1 and 2 students and a lack of fidelity implementing differentiating instruction. The school will focus on the targeted element of differentiated instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

When effectively tracking student progress and implementing differentiated instruction, students in Grades 3 are expected to show improvement in ELA as measured by the 2023-2024 FAST PM3 assessment. Utilizing ongoing data, teachers can identify areas of weakness in phonics, academic vocabulary, and comprehension skills, and provide targeted instruction during teacher-led small group using differentiating instruction strategies. This approach aims to increase our students' proficiency levels in ELA, with a target of a 2 percentage point increase (schoolwide average of 84%) on the 2023-2024 FAST ELA PM3 administration.

Monitoring:

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

The Springview leadership team will hold quarterly data chats with teachers, maintain flexible grouping based on current data and conduct regular walk throughs to ensure high-quality differentiated instruction. Teachers will conduct data chats with students and parents to offer actionable feedback to assist students in self monitoring and goal setting for their learning. They will also utilize data trackers to monitor weekly usage and establish a schoolwide recognition program to celebrate individual class achievements. Additionally, the MTSS team will meet monthly to monitor OPM data and identify students who need additional support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catalina Flor (pr5361@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 selected evidence-based strategy for our Area of Focus is Differentiated Instruction. Differentiated Instruction is an Instructional Framework that involves providing students with various strategies and/or content tailored to their specific needs. This ensures they possess the foundational knowledge required to achieve mastery of grade level benchmark. Within the specific area of differentiation, our school will concentrate on implementing the evidence based strategy of data-driven decision making. Data-driven decision making is a process embedded in the culture of the school where data is used at every level to make informed decisions on what is best for students. This includes goal setting, interventions, teacher placement, course work differentiated instructional models of support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We have chosen the strategy of differentiated instruction based on consistent data that indicates 3rd grade ELA demonstrates the lowest percentage of proficiency. If teachers solely focus on grade level benchmark and curriculum, without equipping students with the necessary foundational skills to access

those grade level skills, it will result in a continued decline in Reading proficiency. To address this concern we will employ data-driven decision making to ensure that student needs are being addressed.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers will have the opportunity to participate in professional learning, focusing on the effective implementation of differentiated instruction in the area of reading. Professional learning sessions will be aligned with the school goal of increasing ELA 3rd grade proficiency.

Person Responsible: Irene Gomez-Lugo (igomez@dadeschools.net)

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

Individualized i-Ready skill based lessons will be assigned from 8/22/23-9/29/23 in order to assist students in understanding their areas of success and areas of improvement.

Person Responsible: Irene Gomez-Lugo (igomez@dadeschools.net)

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

Resource teachers will use the push-in model in the Reading classes in order to assist the ELA L25 percent with differentiation.

Person Responsible: Irene Gomez-Lugo (igomez@dadeschools.net)

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Through a careful review of the District 2022-2023 attendance reports, 23% of our students had 10 or more absences. Springview and the District demonstrated the same trend in student absences of 10 and above (23%). The analysis revealed a consistent pattern wherein low attendance rates directly correlated with decreased academic achievement and progress. By recognizing the strong link between attendance and student success, it became evident that addressing attendance issues is essential to improving overall educational outcomes. Therefore, creating an attendance incentive and prioritizing student attendance initiatives will be a key focus in order to enhance student engagement, participation, and ultimately, academic performance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to decrease the number of students with more than 10 absences by three percentage points to be at 20%.

Monitoring:

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

The Attendance Review Committee and Leadership Team will meet monthly and monitor the number of students who have 10 absences or more. Attendance will be monitored through regular analysis of attendance records, targeted interventions, attendance initiatives and progress tracking.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Irene Gomez-Lugo (igomez@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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The implementation of attendance initiatives as an evidence-based intervention aims to improve student attendance rates, reduce chronic absenteeism, and create a positive school climate that values regular attendance. By utilizing comprehensive attendance tracking, providing early intervention and targeted support, engaging parents and the community, employing positive reinforcement strategies, and conducting data monitoring and analysis, schools can increase student attendance and, consequently, enhance students' overall academic success and well-being.

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.

Counselor will call parents once the child has three absences.

Person Responsible: Irene Gomez-Lugo (igomez@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23 - 9/29/23

Classes with 100% attendance will be announced daily on the morning announcements in order to continue to motivate all students.

Person Responsible: Sylvia Castro-Hernandez (scastro-hernandez@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23 - 9/29/23

Students with five absences or more will be referred to the school's social worker.

Person Responsible: Irene Gomez-Lugo (igomez@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23 - 9/29/23

#4. 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 School Climate Survey, 53% of the staff agreed that "I frequently feel overloaded and overwhelmed by working at my school." The school needs to develop teacher leaders by involving them in school-wide initiatives and ensuring they are informed and feel as though they are invested in the school community. By involving them in school-wide committees such as grade level chairs and department heads, teachers will be able to contribute positively to the school's culture by a 5% increase in staff involvement.

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 Targeted Element of Leadership development, there will be a 5% decrease in the staff members who agree with the statement, "I frequently feel overloaded and overwhelmed by working at my school," equaling 48% in our 2023-2024 School Climate Survey.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team will identify specific staff members that are experts in areas that will serve as leads with initiatives. By involving teachers, we hope to create an environment of shared leadership. Teachers who receive support will share the knowledge they have during grade level/department meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catalina Flor (pr5361@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 Leadership Development, we will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Involving Staff in the decision making process. We hope to increase shared leadership by involving teachers that are experts. Experts in the building will keep us updated in faculty meetings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Involving Staff will allow the expertise of teachers to carry out the school's vision and mission with fidelity and allow for a community feel.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers are able to present information at the monthly faculty meetings in order to take a more leadership role.

Person Responsible: Catalina Flor (pr5361@dadeschools.net)

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

The Leadership Team will meet monthly, in order to allow teachers to take on more active leadership roles in the school such as Grade level chairperson, Committee Chairperson for Hispanic Heritage, Safety Committee, etc.

Person Responsible: Catalina Flor (pr5361@dadeschools.net)

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

Teachers will have the opportunity to sign up for school-wide committees and before/after school activities.

Person Responsible: Catalina Flor (pr5361@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).

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

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.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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

N/A

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.

n/a

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))

n/a

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

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(l))

NA

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

NA

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

NA

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

NA

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | |
|---|--------|---|--------|--|--|
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | | | |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | \$0.00 | | |
| 4 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other | \$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