

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Henry S. West Laboratory School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 25 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 25 |

Henry S. West Laboratory School

5300 CARILLO ST, Coral Gables, FL 33146

<http://westlab.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.

Henry S. West Laboratory School provides a learning environment in which all students are able to attain their maximum academic, social, and physical potential, thus enabling them to become interested learners and contributing members in a changing, multicultural society. Students are afforded the opportunity to capitalize on their inherent strengths through their participation in high level curricular and extracurricular activities. Individualized instruction and tutorial programs are provided as needed. Periodic evaluations, designed to diagnose and assess achievement, provide data for addressing needs and serve as a baseline for the School Improvement Plan. The West Laboratory School and University of Miami partnership enhance the educational opportunities for students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Henry S. West Laboratory School will provide high quality education for all students and will pioneer the possibilities of change in the teaching and learning process. As a professional development school in conjunction with the stakeholders and the University of Miami, our vision is to prepare students to become life-long learners and productive citizens. As a clinical setting for aspiring teachers, the school will train and retrain teachers to meet the challenges of preparing students for the future.

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 |
|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Sanchez, Michelle | Principal | Serve as instructional leader for the District's first school of choice. Lead the school's transition from a traditional approach to curriculum, instruction and assessment to a school-wide approach that is aligned to the Florida Standards and integrates the Social Emotional Learning Competencies. Lead the school's partnership with the University of Miami to provide STEAM electives to middle grades students. |
| Villazon, Jacqueline | Assistant Principal | Support the principal's vision and mission by supervising the execution of tasks that are needed to be accomplished to ensure that the day to day operations ran smoothly (Master schedule, School Support Team, Discipline, Security/ Custodial). Oversee instructional program Serve as LEA. MTSS Coordinator. |
| Gonzalez, C. Karelissa | Teacher, K-12 | Empower teachers to deliver high-quality instruction utilizing a standards-based curriculum. Participates in professional development and shares the content with school-wide personnel. Plans department meetings within the school. Promotes rigor, relevance, and relationships in English Language Arts classrooms. Encourage an English Language Arts rich classroom environment. |
| Hernandez, Susan | Teacher, K-12 | Empower teachers to deliver high-quality instruction utilizing a standards-based curriculum. Participates in professional development and shares the content with school-wide personnel. Plans department meetings within the school. Promotes rigor, relevance, and relationships in Mathematics classrooms. Encourage Mathematics rich classroom environment. |

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.

Members of the leadership team met to discuss prior year's data. All data was thoroughly analyzed and discussed. A strategic plan was developed with the insight from team members. This plan identifies areas in need of improvement as well as specific strategies to target these needs, including regular progress monitoring. The School Improvement Plan was developed and is being implemented with input from all stakeholders. Additionally, during our EESAC meeting, the various stakeholders met to analyze data, review the areas of focus, and provide feedback.

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))

Members of the leadership team will meet quarterly to review available data and analyze assessment results to determine the effectiveness of the plan. Changes will be made, as needed, if it is determined that more strategic intervention is required to meet the school's goal.

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 KG-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 77% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 34% |
| 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) 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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

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

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 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 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 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 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 90 | 61 | 53 | 92 | 62 | 55 | 95 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 70 | | | 71 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 70 | | | 78 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 89 | 63 | 55 | 91 | 51 | 42 | 87 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 86 | | | 61 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 79 | | | 64 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 83 | 56 | 52 | 90 | 60 | 54 | 78 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 100 | 77 | 68 | 97 | 68 | 59 | 97 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 85 | 75 | 70 | 94 | 61 | 51 | 76 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | 76 | 74 | | 53 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | 73 | 53 | | 78 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | 62 | 55 | | 75 | 70 | | | |

* 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 | 90 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 541 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 85 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 769 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 74 | | | |
| ELL | 87 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 81 | | | |
| HSP | 91 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 91 | | | |
| FRL | 84 | | | |

| 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 | 80 | | | |
| ELL | 84 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 86 | | | |
| HSP | 83 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 85 | | | |
| FRL | 84 | | | |

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 | 90 | | | 89 | | | 83 | 100 | 85 | | | |
| SWD | 76 | | | 71 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| ELL | 91 | | | 82 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 86 | | | 75 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| HSP | 89 | | | 89 | | | 81 | 100 | 89 | | 6 | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 93 | | | 94 | | | 85 | | | | 3 | |
| FRL | 85 | | | 79 | | | 65 | 100 | | | 5 | |

| 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 | 92 | 70 | 70 | 91 | 86 | 79 | 90 | 97 | 94 | | | |
| SWD | 70 | | | 90 | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 75 | | | 92 | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| BLK | 100 | 77 | | 86 | 85 | | 80 | | | | | |
| HSP | 90 | 68 | 69 | 91 | 85 | 75 | 87 | 95 | 89 | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 92 | 72 | 64 | 92 | 87 | | 100 | | | | | |
| FRL | 86 | 69 | 65 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 91 | | 94 | | | |

| 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 | 95 | 71 | 78 | 87 | 61 | 64 | 78 | 97 | 76 | | | |
| SWD | 70 | | | 30 | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 90 | 50 | | 86 | 70 | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 100 | 80 | | 60 | 50 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 95 | 73 | 78 | 86 | 58 | 65 | 80 | 95 | 77 | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 94 | 60 | | 92 | 66 | | 83 | | | | | |
| FRL | 93 | 80 | 81 | 85 | 60 | 58 | 83 | 94 | | | | |

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.

| Grade | Year | ELA | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| | | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 90% | 56% | 34% | 54% | 36% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 97% | 50% | 47% | 47% | 50% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 91% | 51% | 40% | 47% | 44% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 95% | 58% | 37% | 58% | 37% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 88% | 50% | 38% | 47% | 41% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 94% | 52% | 42% | 50% | 44% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 97% | 58% | 39% | 54% | 43% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 79% | 63% | 16% | 59% | 20% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 93% | 64% | 29% | 61% | 32% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 100% | 59% | 41% | 55% | 45% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 86% | 58% | 28% | 55% | 31% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 82% | 40% | 42% | 44% | 38% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 84% | 50% | 34% | 51% | 33% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 85% | 56% | 29% | 50% | 35% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 100% | 68% | 32% | 66% | 34% |

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was the 8th Grade Statewide Science Assessment. A contributing factor to this performance includes having a new teacher in this subject/grade level. Historically, results of the science assessments at Henry S. West Laboratory School demonstrate that our scores outperform the District and State. Additionally, our school has been #1 in the District in the area of science. This year we are #6.

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was the 8th Grade Statewide Science Assessment as evidenced by 82 percent proficiency, a decrease of 9 percentage points from 2022 where the school achieved 91% proficiency. A contributing factor to this performance includes having a new teacher in this subject/grade level who was becoming acclimated to the subject matter and the standards.

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.

Based on the state assessments that were administered, there was no visible gap when compared to the state average. Although there was a decline in Science proficiency in 5th (6 percentage points from 90 to 84) and 8th grade, and there was a slight decrease of 3 percentage points from 93 to 90 in Mathematics (grades 3-8) as compared to last year, the school still outperformed the overall state averages.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Civics with an increase of 7 percentage points from 93 to 100 proficiency, and Reading (grades 3-8) with an increase of 2 percentage points from 91 to 93 proficiency. The increase in Civics is attributed to the fact that the teacher in that subject was more familiar with the concepts being taught and was able to incorporate strategies that allowed students to have a better understanding of the topics being taught. She also emphasized instruction on specific benchmarks based on mini assessment data throughout the school year. In Reading, there was a stronger and more strategic emphasis on providing intervention to students who demonstrated difficulty in certain topics being taught. These topics were revisited during intervention to provide students with an opportunity to better understand the benchmarks.

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

The Early Warning Sign that continues to be an area of concern is attendance. During the 2023-24 school year, additional emphasis will be placed in this area and members of the leadership team will convene early in the year to develop a plan to target excessive absences. Furthermore, Attendance Review Committee meetings will continue to be held throughout the year for students with 3 or more absences.

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

The priorities for school improvement for the 2023-24 school year are ranked as follows:

- 1) 8th Grade Science
- 2) 5th Grade Science
- 3) 3rd-8th Mathematics

- 4) Attendance
- 5) Staff Morale

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 to the 2023 PM3 Statewide Science Assessment data, there was a decrease of 9 percentage points in the 8th grade Statewide Science Assessment from 91% proficiency to 82% proficiency. Based on the review of the 2023 FSA results and Topic Assessment data, faculty will align learning to standards to ensure that a higher level of learning is attained which will guide teachers in the process of assessment and help keep them on track. Additionally, standards-based instruction will help guide the planning, implementation, and assessment of student learning that will lead to a 5% proficiency increase in 8th grade Science.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of standards-based instruction and scaffolding, 95% of students in 8th grade will demonstrate mastery of key benchmark-aligned concepts and skills, as evidenced by achieving a score of 90% or higher on the benchmark assessment administered at the end of each instructional unit.

Monitoring:

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

During regular walkthroughs administration will review lessons plans and look at classrooms to see evidence of the successful implementation of Standards-aligned instruction. During monthly curriculum council and grade level meetings, all available data will be analyzed as part of Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) to ensure students are demonstrating growth on remediated standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Sanchez (michellemsanchez@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 Differentiated Instruction, our school will focus on using data from the 2023 PM3 Statewide Science Assessment, as well as topic assessment data, to strategically identify students based on their individual needs and provide them with rigorous differentiated instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of: acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability. Research demonstrates this method benefits a wide range of students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The administration will conduct frequent walk-throughs/observations to ensure that our teachers are focusing on hands-on experiments that review and solidify science standards. As a result, there will be greater accountability which will directly impact student achievement.

Person Responsible: Michelle Sanchez (michellemsanchez@dadeschools.net)

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

During weekly department meetings, science teachers will discuss data findings and develop lesson plans containing differentiated instruction/ reciprocal teaching techniques for all students. As a result, there will be visible evidence of rigorous differentiated instruction taking place in the science classrooms which will allow teachers to target all students in a variety of teaching methods.

Person Responsible: Michelle Sanchez (michellemsanchez@dadeschools.net)

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

After the baseline exam, the Science team will review the data to develop intervention groups that can meet in the morning or can be pulled out to review benchmarks that need reinforcement. As a result, these targeted students will demonstrate improvement in academic performance as evidenced in topic assessment results and other classroom assessments.

Person Responsible: Michelle Sanchez (michellemsanchez@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 to the 2023 PM3 Statewide Science Assessment data, there was a 3 percentage point decrease in 5th grade from 87% proficiency to 84%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of a teacher new to the grade level and content, we will implement the targeted element of benchmark-aligned instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of data-driven instruction, an additional 8% of students in 5th grade (for a total of 92%) will demonstrate proficiency in the 2024 Statewide Science Assessment as evidenced by scoring a Level 3 or above by June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Results of baseline data and topic assessment data will be utilized to develop strategic lessons geared towards closing any gaps found as evidenced by the assessment results. Additionally, the administrative team will conduct classroom walkthroughs weekly to ensure standards-based instruction is taking place in all classrooms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Sanchez (michellemsanchez@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 intervention of data-driven instruction. Data-driven instruction includes developing lessons that are aligned to the District's pacing guides. Progress monitoring will also take place regularly to ensure that students are demonstrating improvement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data-driven instruction is an educational approach that relies on the teachers' use of student performance data to inform instructional planning and delivery. This systematic approach of instruction uses assessment, analysis, and actions to meet student's needs. As a result of implementing this approach, students in grades 5 and 8 will demonstrate improvement in their overall performance as evidenced by the results of their topic assessments and other classroom 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 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The administrative team will develop a walkthrough schedule and data chat schedule to ensure classroom instruction is aligned with standards and that ongoing progress monitoring is taking place, prior to the initial instructional leadership team Meeting. As a result, our leadership team will have a better understanding of what steps need to be taken to ensure rigorous, standards-based instruction is taking place and adjustments are made as needed.

Person Responsible: Michelle Sanchez (michellemsanchez@dadeschools.net)

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

Grade level/ department heads will meet with their teams to identify specific assessments that will be utilized to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction across standards specific to the subject(s) being taught. As a result, teachers will have an opportunity to share best practices with their colleagues and implement techniques or strategies that have proven effective in other classrooms.

Person Responsible: Michelle Sanchez (michellemsanchez@dadeschools.net)

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

At the Opening of Schools PD, teachers will learn how to access textbooks and pacing guides in the Schoology platform to create lessons aligned to the standards. As a result, this will ensure that all teachers have received the necessary training to access all resources through Schoology.

Person Responsible: Susan Hernandez (susanhernandez@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/15/23

#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.

According to data from the 2023 District Attendance Report, 19% of students had 11 or more absences as compared to 17% in the 2021-2022 school year. Based on the data and the contributing factors of parents not being aware or understanding the impact of students' absences on student achievement and teacher and staff's concern on student attendance, we will implement the targeted element of Early Warning System.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Response to Early Warning Systems (EWS), there will be a 5 percentage decrease of students with 11 or more absences (for a total of 14%) as evidenced by the 2023-2024 District Attendance Report.

Monitoring:

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

Henry S. West Laboratory will implement an attendance incentive program where student attendance will be monitored, and schoolwide incentives will be awarded to students who have perfect attendance each quarter. An attendance committee will convene periodically to develop a plan to continue promoting regular attendance of students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Sanchez (michellemsanchez@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 Early Warning Systems, our school will focus on the evidence-based intervention of Response to Early Warning Systems. Response to Early Warning Systems will help to identify students that their attendance is impacting their academic progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Response to Early Warning Systems (EWS) involves establishing a system based on student data to identify students who exhibit behavior or academic performance that puts them at risk of dropping out of school. Response to EWS utilizes predictive data, identifies off-track or at-risk students, targets interventions, and reveals patterns and root causes.

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.

Our school will complete the Targeted Student Status Form monthly. As part of this process, we will contact parents and implement attendance incentives. As a result, parents will be more informed of our expectations and they will assist in motivating students to attend school regularly.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

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

Attendance will be monitored daily to identify discrepancies. Teachers will thoroughly review the attendance bulletin each day and inform the attendance clerk if any errors were found. As a result, any discrepancy will be corrected immediately.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

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

Our school will provide incentives to students who achieve perfect attendance each grading period. As a result, our attendance rate will increase.

Person Responsible: Michelle Sanchez-Perez (pr5831@dadeschools.net)

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

#4. 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 2023 FAST PM3 Mathematics data, 91% of our students in grades 3-8 demonstrated proficiency, This percentage was stagnant when compared to data from the 2021-2022 school where the proficiency was also 91%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of having students in the lower grades who were performing below grade level, we will implement the targeted element of differentiation.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of differentiated instruction, there will be an improvement of 3 percentage points schoolwide (for a total of 94%) as evidenced by the 2023-2024 FAST PM3 Mathematics by June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Differentiated Instruction will be monitored through walk-throughs, teacher observations, and available data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Sanchez (michellemsanchez@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 Differentiation, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Differentiated Instruction (DI). Differentiated Instruction will assist in accelerating proficiency in Mathematics. Differentiated Instruction will be monitored through the use of classroom walkthroughs and monitoring of assessment data for each content area.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of: acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability. Research demonstrates this method benefits a wide range of students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The school leadership team will create a monthly calendar with specific biweekly dates designated for departmental or grade level planning as evidenced by the meeting calendar and meeting agendas. As a

result, teachers will implement strategies discussed in such meetings in their lesson plans, curricular activities, and differentiated instruction plans as evidenced through classroom walkthroughs, teacher lesson plans, and portfolio of student work.

Person Responsible: Michelle Sanchez (michellemsanchez@dadeschools.net)

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

Teachers will be provided with differentiated instruction strategies and opportunities for collaborative discussions by their curriculum leader and/or instructional coach through biweekly department and biweekly grade level teams. As a result, teachers will implement strategies discussed in such meeting in their lesson plans, differentiated instruction plans, and curricular activities as evidenced through classroom walkthroughs, teacher lesson plans, and portfolio of student work.

Person Responsible: Michelle Sanchez (michellemsanchez@dadeschools.net)

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

Teachers will create a differentiated instruction plan based on FAST PM 1 and/or i-Ready AP1 Diagnostic Data to group students based on needs. The differentiated instruction plan will be submitted to the administrative team. As a result, teachers will be able to identify and target students to provide tiered instruction to meet their needs.

Person Responsible: Michelle Sanchez (michellemsanchez@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

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: Early Warning System | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | \$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