**Miami-Dade County Public Schools** 

# Carrie P. Meek/Westview K 8 Center School



2023-24 Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

# **Table of Contents**

| SIP Authority and Purpose                                   | 3  |
|---|----|
|   |    |
| I. School Information                                       | 6  |
|   |    |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review                            | 11 |
|   |    |
| III. Planning for Improvement                               | 17 |
|   |    |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review                       | 0  |
|   |    |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 25 |
|   |    |
| VI. Title I Requirements                                    | 28 |
|   |    |
| VII Budget to Support Areas of Focus                        | 30 |

## Carrie P. Meek/Westview K 8 Center

2101 NW 127TH ST, Miami, FL 33167

http://stingerterritory.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), <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">https://www.floridacims.org</a>, 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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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.

The mission of Carrie P. Meek/Westview K-8 Center is to collaborate with parents, teachers, faculty, students, and the community to provide an atmosphere conducive to the facilitation of learning in a safe environment. To focus our resources to equip students with skills and character that will serve as building blocks to become effective leaders and to educate every student with respect; maximizing their strengths and working collaboratively to overcome their challenges. We are committed to moving forward and as Henry Ford stated, "If everyone is moving forward together, then success takes care of itself."

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Carrie P. Meek/Westview K-8 Center is to create an environment where all students and parents are valued and respected by every staff member. We envision a school where educational leaders foster a healthy relationship between the school and the home. A place where everyone is working collaboratively to set high standards for our students and to guide them on a path towards success. We seek to provide innovative programs to enhance and strengthen our curriculum and to promote the skills needed by the 21st century learner.

## 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<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|---------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Richardson,<br>Tommy      | Principal              | As the Principal: -Sets performance objectives for all stakeholders (teachers, students, parents, etc.) -Monitors and implements all academic protocols and focuses on increased students' achievement gains for continuous improvementIdentifies school level objectives each year and develops a plan for their attainmentMonitors and implements all cultural protocols and identifies ways to develop an action plan to enhance staff and student moraleMonitors and implements school policies and safety protocols which focuses on increased student achievement gains for continuous school improvementWorks collaboratively with Educational Excellence School Advisory Councils (EESAC) to identify school wide needs and implements plans to meet identified needs which support the School Improvement processArranges and conducts in-service activities and meetings -Responsible for the implementation and the determination of the effects of the individualized professional development plan for all instructional personnel that is linked to improved student performance. |
| McIntosh,<br>Shekinah     | Assistant<br>Principal | As the Assistant Principal:  -Assist the principal in setting performance objectives for all stakeholders (teachers, students, parents, etc.)  -Monitors and implements all academic and cultural protocols  -Monitors and implements school policies and safety protocols which focuses on increased student achievement gains for continuous school improvement.  -Assist the principal in identifying school level objectives each year and develops a plan for their attainment  -Works collaboratively with the Educational Excellence School Advisory Councils (EESAC) to identify school wide needs and implements plans to meet identified needs which support the School Improvement Process -Arranges and conducts in-service activities and meetings  -Assist the Principal with the implementation and the determination of the effects of the individualized professional development for all instructional personnel that is linked to improved student performance.  |
| ORR,<br>MELISSA           | Instructional<br>Coach | As the ELA/Reading Instructional Coach: -Build teachers capacity (Coaching support and cycles) -Provide consistently collaborative planning with teachers -Provide professional development and/or trainings that enables teachers to think reflectively about improve student learning   |
| BURNS-<br>DAVIS,<br>TERRI | Instructional<br>Coach | As the Science Coach: -Assist with the coordination and implementation K-12 Comprehensive Science Plan at the school levelUtilize the coaching model to provide teachers an interactive, integrated,  |

| Name                | Position<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|
|                     |                        | hands-on, inquiry-based instructional model at the school site.  -Provide site-based professional development to staff that is aligned to the needs of students and teachers based upon student assessment data.  -Assists administration and classroom in the interpretation of student assessment data.  -Assists in coordinating and monitoring student interventions  |
| WRIGHT,<br>DASHANTI | Instructional<br>Coach | As the ELA/Reading Coach: -Assist with building teacher capacity (coaching support) -Provide resources and plain language dialogue to assist with collaborative planning process with teachers -Assist with providing professional development and trainings that enables teachers to think reflectively and improve student learning and implementing various instructional programs and practices.  |
| BORGES,<br>THERESA  | Instructional<br>Coach | As the Math Instructional Coach:  -Assist with building teacher capacity (coaching support and resources)  -Utilize the coaching model to provide teachers an interactive, integrated, hands-on, inquiry-based instructional model at the school site.  -Provide site-based professional development to staff that is aligned to the needs of students and teachers based upon student assessment data.  -Assists administration and classroom in the interpretation of student assessment data.  -Assists in coordinating and monitoring student interventions |

## Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) consist of multiple stakeholders consisting of the principal, assistant principal, teachers, non-instructional staffers, community members, students, business owners and interested parties to name a few. At these meetings it was discussed the various challenges and needs that would go into improving the schools academic, athletic, and achievement standings. Each stakeholder was afforded multiple opportunities to add to the development process of vision of the school.

## **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 is a living document that has input from multiple stakeholders here at Carrie P. Meek/Westview K-8. Therefore, our goal is to ensure that the SIP is tracked by multiple individuals. Administration and

instructional coaches are responsible for tracking data on a daily basis. Data-chats with students, teachers, parents, and administration are the primary ways of communicating the academic and achievement portions of this SIP. Attendance calls, intervention and MTSS are utilized for the attendance portion of the SIP.

## **Demographic Data**

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| 2023-24 Status  | Active                                    |
|---|---|
| (per MSID File)   |   |
| School Type and Grades Served                                   | Combination School                        |
| (per MSID File)   | PK-8                                      |
| Primary Service Type  | K-12 General Education                    |
| (per MSID File) 2022-23 Title I School Status                   | Yes                                       |
|   |   |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate   | 99%                                       |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate                   | 100%                                      |
| Charter School  | No  |
| RAISE School  | Yes                                       |
| ESSA Identification   |   |
| *updated as of 3/11/2024  | N/A                                       |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)          | No  |
|   | Students With Disabilities (SWD)          |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented                              | English Language Learners (ELL)           |
| (subgroups with 10 or more students)                            | Black/African American Students (BLK)     |
| (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an   | Hispanic Students (HSP)                   |
| asterisk)   | Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
|   | 2021-22: B                                |
| School Grades History   | 2019-20: C                                |
| *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2018-19: C                                |
|   | 2017-18: C                                |
| School Improvement Rating History                               |   |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History                               |   |
|   | •   |

## **Early Warning Systems**

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

| Indicator   |   | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |       |  |  |
|---|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|--|--|
| indicator   | K | 1           | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  | Total |  |  |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 0 | 11          | 23 | 14 | 12 | 15 | 23 | 17 | 28 | 143   |  |  |
| One or more suspensions   | 0 | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 6     |  |  |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0 | 0           | 0  | 8  | 9  | 5  | 8  | 10 | 17 | 57    |  |  |
| Course failure in Math  | 0 | 0           | 0  | 8  | 8  | 4  | 5  | 3  | 15 | 43    |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0 | 0           | 0  | 0  | 11 | 14 | 3  | 17 | 24 | 69    |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0 | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17 | 9  | 3  | 28 | 57    |  |  |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0           | 14 | 8  | 21 | 10 | 7  | 10 | 11 | 81    |  |  |

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 |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |    |       |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|----|-------|--|--|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8  | Total |  |  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 43    |  |  |

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

| Indicator                           |   | Total |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K | 1     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0 | 0     | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0     | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 16    |

## 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   | K  | 1           | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  | Total |  |  |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 11 | 23          | 14 | 12 | 15 | 23 | 17 | 28 | 19 | 162   |  |  |
| One or more suspensions   | 0  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |  |  |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0  | 6           | 18 | 24 | 5  | 6  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 59    |  |  |
| Course failure in Math  | 0  | 2           | 8  | 11 | 4  | 5  | 3  | 0  | 0  | 33    |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0  | 0           | 0  | 24 | 10 | 13 | 23 | 28 | 15 | 113   |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0  | 0           | 0  | 19 | 12 | 13 | 33 | 35 | 21 | 133   |  |  |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0  | 9           | 24 | 31 | 19 | 26 | 39 | 38 | 23 | 209   |  |  |

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

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

## The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator                           |   | Grade Level |    |    |   |   |   |   |   |       |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|--|--|--|
| Indicator                           | K | 1           | 2  | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |  |  |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0 | 1           | 11 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30    |  |  |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1           | 0  | 1  | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 12    |  |  |  |

## 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   | K  | 1           | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  | Total |  |  |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 11 | 23          | 14 | 12 | 15 | 23 | 17 | 28 | 19 | 162   |  |  |
| One or more suspensions   | 0  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |  |  |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0  | 6           | 18 | 24 | 5  | 6  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 59    |  |  |
| Course failure in Math  | 0  | 2           | 8  | 11 | 4  | 5  | 3  | 0  | 0  | 33    |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0  | 0           | 0  | 24 | 10 | 13 | 23 | 28 | 15 | 113   |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0  | 0           | 0  | 19 | 12 | 13 | 33 | 35 | 21 | 133   |  |  |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0  | 9           | 24 | 31 | 19 | 26 | 39 | 38 | 23 | 209   |  |  |

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

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

#### The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |    |    |   |   |   |   |   |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| mulcator                            | K           | 1 | 2  | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 1 | 11 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 1 | 0  | 1  | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 12    |

## 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*                   | 47     | 61       | 53    | 42     | 62       | 55    | 36     |          |       |  |  |
| ELA Learning Gains                 |        |          |       | 53     |          |       | 33     |          |       |  |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile         |        |          |       | 49     |          |       | 33     |          |       |  |  |
| Math Achievement*                  | 49     | 63       | 55    | 42     | 51       | 42    | 28     |          |       |  |  |
| Math Learning Gains                |        |          |       | 62     |          |       | 22     |          |       |  |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile        |        |          |       | 66     |          |       | 31     |          |       |  |  |
| Science Achievement*               | 41     | 56       | 52    | 38     | 60       | 54    | 38     |          |       |  |  |
| Social Studies Achievement*        | 72     | 77       | 68    | 60     | 68       | 59    | 49     |          |       |  |  |
| Middle School Acceleration         | 75     | 75       | 70    | 86     | 61       | 51    | 50     |          |       |  |  |
| Graduation Rate                    |        | 76       | 74    |        | 53       | 50    |        |          |       |  |  |
| College and Career<br>Acceleration |        | 73       | 53    |        | 78       | 70    |        |          |       |  |  |
| ELP Progress                       | 22     | 62       | 55    | 55     | 75       | 70    | 39     |          |       |  |  |

<sup>\*</sup> In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

# **ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |     |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 51  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 0   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 356 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 7   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 98  |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index           |     |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)     | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 55  |

| 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      | 553 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 10  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Tested                                 | 99  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# **ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

|                  |                                       | 2022-23 ES               | SA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMAF                               | RY  |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| ESSA<br>Subgroup | Federal<br>Percent of<br>Points Index | Subgroup<br>Below<br>41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive<br>Years the Subgroup is<br>Below 32% |
| SWD              | 48                                    |                          |   |   |
| ELL              | 51                                    |                          |   |   |
| AMI              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| ASN              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| BLK              | 43                                    |                          |   |   |
| HSP              | 56                                    |                          |   |   |
| MUL              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| PAC              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| WHT              |                                       |                          |   |   |
| FRL              | 49                                    |                          |   |   |

|                  | 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ESSA<br>Subgroup | Federal<br>Percent of<br>Points Index | Subgroup<br>Below<br>41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive<br>Years the Subgroup is<br>Below 32% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SWD              | 53                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELL              | 55                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AMI              |                                       |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ASN              |                                       |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLK              | 54                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HSP              | 55                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|                  | 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ESSA<br>Subgroup | Federal<br>Percent of<br>Points Index | Subgroup<br>Below<br>41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive<br>Years the Subgroup is<br>Below 32% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MUL              |                                       |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PAC              |                                       |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHT              |                                       |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FRL              | 54                                    |                          |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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<br>Ach.                                    | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2021-22 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2021-22 | ELP<br>Progress |  |  |
| All<br>Students | 47   |        |                | 49           |            |                    | 41          | 72      | 75           |                         |                           | 22              |  |  |
| SWD             | 48   |        |                | 55           |            |                    | 67          | 58      |              |                         | 6                         | 18              |  |  |
| ELL             | 50   |        |                | 68           |            |                    | 60          |         |              |                         | 5                         | 22              |  |  |
| AMI             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| ASN             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| BLK             | 43   |        |                | 44           |            |                    | 42          | 69      |              |                         | 6                         | 16              |  |  |
| HSP             | 59   |        |                | 64           |            |                    | 36          | 83      |              |                         | 6                         | 27              |  |  |
| MUL             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| PAC             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| WHT             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| FRL             | 45   |        |                | 46           |            |                    | 39          | 75      | 70           |                         | 7                         | 25              |  |  |

|                 | 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
|-----------------|--|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Subgroups       | ELA<br>Ach.                                    | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 | ELP<br>Progress |  |  |
| All<br>Students | 42   | 53     | 49             | 42           | 62         | 66                 | 38          | 60      | 86           |                         |                           | 55              |  |  |
| SWD             | 49   | 53     | 40             | 54           | 63         | 73                 | 33          | 64      |              |                         |                           | 50              |  |  |
| ELL             | 42   | 51     | 50             | 50           | 76         | 82                 | 36          |         |              |                         |                           | 55              |  |  |
| AMI             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| ASN             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |

|           | 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
|-----------|--|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach.                                    | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 | ELP<br>Progress |  |  |
| BLK       | 39   | 52     | 49             | 40           | 62         | 67                 | 36          | 59      | 83           |                         |                           | 55              |  |  |
| HSP       | 55   | 59     | 50             | 51           | 60         |                    | 53          | 60      |              |                         |                           | 55              |  |  |
| MUL       |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| PAC       |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| WHT       |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |  |  |
| FRL       | 42   | 54     | 49             | 41           | 61         | 64                 | 37          | 60      | 82           |                         |                           | 54              |  |  |

|                 | 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
|-----------------|--|--------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Subgroups       | ELA<br>Ach.                                    | ELA LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 | ELP<br>Progress |
| All<br>Students | 36   | 33     | 33             | 28           | 22         | 31                 | 38          | 49      | 50           |                         |                           | 39              |
| SWD             | 34   | 42     | 38             | 39           | 37         | 27                 | 33          |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| ELL             | 33   | 43     | 33             | 31           | 24         |                    | 33          |         |              |                         |                           | 39              |
| AMI             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| ASN             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| BLK             | 34   | 33     | 36             | 26           | 21         | 34                 | 34          | 47      | 53           |                         |                           | 29              |
| HSP             | 42   | 35     | 23             | 38           | 25         |                    | 52          |         |              |                         |                           | 50              |
| MUL             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| PAC             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| WHT             |  |        |                |              |            |                    |             |         |              |                         |                           |                 |
| FRL             | 35   | 33     | 33             | 28           | 21         | 29                 | 38          | 45      | 48           |                         |                           | 38              |

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

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

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

|       |               |        | ELA      |                                   |       |                                |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 52%    | 56%      | -4%                               | 54%   | -2%                            |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 34%    | 50%      | -16%                              | 47%   | -13%                           |

|       |               |        | ELA      |                                   |       |                                |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 21%    | 51%      | -30%                              | 47%   | -26%                           |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 55%    | 58%      | -3%                               | 58%   | -3%                            |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 41%    | 50%      | -9%                               | 47%   | -6%                            |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 39%    | 52%      | -13%                              | 50%   | -11%                           |

|       |               |        | MATH     |                                   |       |                                |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 59%    | 58%      | 1%                                | 54%   | 5%                             |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 22%    | 48%      | -26%                              | 48%   | -26%                           |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 76%    | 63%      | 13%                               | 59%   | 17%                            |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 34%    | 64%      | -30%                              | 61%   | -27%                           |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 13%    | 59%      | -46%                              | 55%   | -42%                           |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 45%    | 58%      | -13%                              | 55%   | -10%                           |

|       |               |        | SCIENCE  |                                   |       |                                |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 9%     | 40%      | -31%                              | 44%   | -35%                           |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 36%    | 50%      | -14%                              | 51%   | -15%                           |

|       |               |        | ALGEBRA  |                                   |       |                                |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| N/A   | 2023 - Spring | 27%    | 56%      | -29%                              | 50%   | -23%                           |

|       |               |        | BIOLOGY  |                                   |       |                                |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| N/A   | 2023 - Spring | 82%    | 65%      | 17%                               | 63%   | 19%                            |

|       |               |        | CIVICS   |                                   |       |                                |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| N/A   | 2023 - Spring | 67%    | 68%      | -1%                               | 66%   | 1%                             |

# **III. Planning for Improvement**

## Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The lowest data point for the 2022-2023 school year was 8th grade science with a 9% proficiency. The contributing factors that caused the low performance was the lack/minimal remediation or intervention.

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

The data component that shows the greatest decline was 8th grade Algebra 1, from 92% to 27%. The 65% decrease was caused by lack of a consistent instructor. The students completed the course with a virtual instructor.

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.

Science component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The states average was 51% and Carrie P Meek was 24%. The contributing factors that caused the low performance was the lack/minimal remediation or intervention in 8th grade.

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

6th grade math showed the greatest improvement with a 43% increase. Explicit core instruction and implemented intervention with fidelity.

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

143 students were absent 10% or more days. This is 25% of our population.

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

Carrie P Meeks highest priority for school improvement are 8th grade science, Algebra I, and attendance.

#### **Area of Focus**

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

## **#1.** Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

## **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2023 FAST PM3 data, the school was at 40% proficient in ELA, 42% proficient in math, and 38% proficient in science. Based on the data and identified contributing factors students are not reading on their grade level. There was a lack of consistency in small-group instruction and remediation in the framework. Collaborative planning target focus will assist teacher with planning and developing small group instruction plans.

## **Measurable Outcome:**

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

With the implementation of collaborative planning, lessons will contribute to the remediation process that should increase proficiency in ELA by 10%, 3% in Math and maintain 38% proficiency or higher in science. Through collaborative planning teachers' instructional framework will be planned from bell to bell providing opportunities for differentiated instruction within small groups to foster a collaborative culture to increase mastery in content benchmarks across all contents.

## **Monitoring:**

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

The Leadership Team will conduct quarterly data chats, follow-up with regular walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of lesson developed in collaborative planning. In Collaborative planning instructional coaches and teachers will map out Instructional Focus Calendars, unwrap benchmarks and create daily learning targets. Teachers will develop small group plans and adjust groups based on current data. Students and teachers will track data and remediate. Quarterly data chats will be conducted to address areas of concerns. Extended learning opportunities will be provided to those students who are not showing growth on Going Progress Monitoring assessments.

## Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tommy Richardson (282344@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 collaborative planning, our school will focus on explicit instruction. Benchmark aligned resources that will be used are i-Ready Magnetic, Wonders Workbook and resources.

## Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborative planning will ensure that teachers are using relevant and aligned resources to guide instruction. In addition, collaborative planning ensures that teachers are implementing instructional best practices to plan lessons that are customized to student's needs. Teachers will continually adjust their instruction, plans, groups 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.

During the process of collaborative planning, coaches and teachers will engage in the exchange of best practices and resources pertaining to small group instruction. Teachers and coaches will pull resources with the primary objective of enhancing reading fluency and comprehension skills among the students.

Person Responsible: Shekinah McIntosh (smcintosh@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

Teachers will have access to professional development opportunities aimed at enhancing their ability to effectively plan and utilize data in order to create targeted small groups focused on improving reading fluency and comprehension.

**Person Responsible:** DASHANTI WRIGHT (316970@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

Data analysis will take place using progress monitoring assessments, topic assessment during collaborative grade-level planning. In addition, during common planning teachers and coaches will the use the district pacing guide to ensure standards are being taught. As a result, teachers will deliver rigorous standard based instruction, share best practices and strategies to address student challenges.

Person Responsible: Shekinah McIntosh (smcintosh@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

## #2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance

## **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 data 65% of our staff members were absent at or over 5 times during the school year as compared to the district average of 27%. Based on the data and other identified contributing factors.

## Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Attendance Initiatives, at least 60% of staff members will have less than 10 absences for the 2023-2024 school year, as measured by attendance records.

## **Monitoring:**

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

The administrative team will monitor staff attendance via the payroll platform. Administration will review attendance monthly reports identifying perfect attendance recipients.

## Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tommy Richardson (282344@dadeschools.net)

#### **Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

Our school will focus on the Evidence-based Intervention of attendance initiatives. Teachers will be recognized and receive incentive for monthly perfect attendance.

#### **Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Strategic Attendance Initiatives involve close monitoring and faculty/staff recognition. Public acknowledging perfect attendance recipients provoking peer accountability.

#### 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.

Pre-planning with collaboration of teachers for attendance incentives.

**Person Responsible:** Shekinah McIntosh (smcintosh@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

Develop calendar for monthly incentives and procedures.

Person Responsible: Shekinah McIntosh (smcintosh@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** September 29, 2023 Gather incentives resources.

Last Modified: 4/25/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 20 of 31

Person Responsible: Tommy Richardson (282344@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29,2023

Publicly recognizing teachers with perfect attendance monthly with incentives.

Person Responsible: Tommy Richardson (282344@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2033

## #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

## **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2022-2023 State Science Assessment, we are at an overall 47% proficient in science. The 2021-2022 data reported that only 38% of students demonstrated proficiency in science. While the data shows an increase of 9 percentile points, our school will continue to target increased proficiency in 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 evidence-based instructional strategies, students demonstrating proficiency on the 2023-2024 Science State Assessment will maintain 38 percentage points.

## **Monitoring:**

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

The leadership team walkthroughs during science instruction will ascertain that labs are conducted with fidelity. Data chats of topic assessments will reveal the effectiveness of the explicit instructions being taught. In turn, the data chats will lead to intervention groups that can be targeted using additional engaging activities. During common planning sessions, thorough reviews of science journals and end products will take place.

## Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shekinah McIntosh (smcintosh@dadeschools.net)

#### **Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

Our school will prioritize the evidence-based approach of Hands-on Learning and Collaborative Learning Structures within the realm of science education. Hands-on learning will enable students to actively explore, engage, and experiment with scientific processes. This approach will foster deeper reflection on evidence derived from observed data, encourage a more exploratory approach to laboratory activities and facilitate collaboration when grappling with abstract or intricate scientific concepts. In parallel, Collaborative Learning Structures will involve students working in small groups of two or more, aiming to collectively seek understanding, establish meaning, and apply scientific content. Moreover, the utilization of Outcome Performance Measures (OPMs) will provide comprehensive data on the proficiency level attained by students in each science topic.

## **Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By ensuring that the teachers effectively implement laboratory activities and offer students ample opportunities for exploration, coupled with the use of Outcome Performance Measures (OPMs) to assess instructional effectiveness, we anticipate a noticeable enhancement in overall proficiency levels by June 2024.

## **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 3 - Promising 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.

Double-dose

Instructional coaches and CSS will provide professional development opportunities on learning the science framework and implementation of explicit and engaging instruction.

Person Responsible: TERRI BURNS-DAVIS (188571@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

Hands-on Labs

Teachers will actively engage in weekly collaborative planning sessions to develop comprehensive lesson plans that incorporate student-centered activities, including science labs and STEM activities.

Person Responsible: TERRI BURNS-DAVIS (188571@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

Small Group Instruction and planning

During the designated science block, science teachers will implement small group instruction, employing a differentiated approach based on students' individual progress as determined by standards-based, relevant data derived from classroom or topic assessments.

**Person Responsible:** TERRI BURNS-DAVIS (188571@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

## #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 data over 40% of our students were absent 11 or more times and only 53% had less than 10 absences during the school year. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors.

## Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Attendance Initiatives, 65% of students will have less than 11 absences for the 2023-2024 school year, as measured by attendance records.

## **Monitoring:**

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

Administration will monitor student attendance via the iattend platform. Student attendance will be tracked. Tracking student attendance will assist with determining which students will be targeted for attendance interventions. Teachers will track class attendance using a class HERE chart and the classes will be posted/acknowledged via social media, morning announcement and on the cafeteria bulletin board.

## Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shekinah McIntosh (smcintosh@dadeschools.net)

#### **Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

Our school will focus on the Evidence-based Intervention of Attendance initiatives. Attendance initiatives will increase student attendance. Increased student attendance will lead to increased student performance.

## **Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Strategic Attendance Initiatives involves close monitoring and reporting of student absences, parent conferences, and more direct measures including home visits and referrals for family agencies as well as incentives for students with perfect attendance such as jean day and attendance parties.

## 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.

During announcements a member from the leadership team will list special attendance incentives that will be available for the winners while also encouraging everyday attendance.

Person Responsible: Tommy Richardson (282344@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

The leadership team will meet to develop a calendar for monthly incentives and also create a system in how and when winners will be announced and awarded.

**Person Responsible:** Shekinah McIntosh (smcintosh@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

The leadership team will gather and display different attendance incentives and resources for future

winners.

**Person Responsible:** Tommy Richardson (282344@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

During the afternoon announcements students who met the attendance criteria will be recognized by a

member from the leadership team.

**Person Responsible:** Shekinah McIntosh (smcintosh@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

# Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

## **Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
   Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

## Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on primary data and identified contributing factors majority of primary students are not reading on their grade level. Small-group instruction was not prioritized in the classroom during last school year. Small group instruction was not implemented with fidelity to impact primary students.

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

According to the 2023 FAST PM3 data, we are at 40% proficient in ELA. Based on the data and identified contributing factors students are not reading on their grade level. Small-group instruction was not prioritized in the classroom during last school year. Small group instruction was not consistently monitored to gauged student improvement. We will implement the targeted element of small group Instruction.

#### **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**

With the implementation of small group instruction, interventionist and consistent monitoring of student data using STAR, i-Ready and the FAST assessment. Instructional staff will provide differentiated instruction within small groups to foster a collaborative culture to increase fluency and phonics.

#### **Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

With the implementation of small group instruction and consistent monitoring of student data our students should maintain 50% or higher proficiency in ELA. The teachers, reading coaches, and interventionists will provide differentiated instruction within small groups to foster a collaborative culture to increase vocabulary and comprehension in ELA.

## **Monitoring**

## Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The Leadership Team will conduct quarterly data chats, follow-up with regular walkthroughs to ensure quality instruction is taking place. Teachers and coaches will adjust groups based on current data. Students and teachers will track data. The data will be analyzed during Leadership Team meetings to ensure students are demonstrating growth on remediated standards. Extended learning opportunities will be provided to those students who are not showing growth on On Going Progress Monitoring assessments.

#### **Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Richarson, Tommy, trich@dadeschools.net

## **Evidence-based Practices/Programs**

#### **Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Gradual Release of Responsibility Model will be used to provide clear expectations and demonstrations, guided practice, and gradually releasing students to practice new skills to demonstrate mastery.

#### 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?

Due to the lack of student's being able to read grade level text, our school decided to implement intentional small group instruction. Teacher/coach will plan for the Gradual Release Model so that students will be provided multiple opportunities to master benchmarks.

#### **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<br>Monitoring             |
|--|--|
| First, the school leadership team will host an in-house professional learning meeting on the implementation and importance of small group instruction utilizing the created framework. | McIntosh, Shekinah,<br>smcintosh@dadeschools.net |
| The leadership team will host another professional development based on small group strategies and best practices that should be implemented during small group instruction.           | McIntosh, Shekinah, smcintosh@dadeschools.net    |
| Both literacy coaches will meet with administration every week to discuss teacher focuses and action steps taken to impact teachers small group instructional practices.               | Richarson, Tommy, trich@dadeschools.net          |
| Both literacy coaches will conduct common planning with teachers weekly to plan for small group instruction.   | McIntosh, Shekinah, smcintosh@dadeschools.net    |
| A School wide system will be implemented to ensure the best testing environment is created for all students.   | Richarson, Tommy, trich@dadeschools.net          |
| Assessment data will be analyzed and used to rearrange small groups and pull the necessary resources to explicitly teach students.   | Richardson, Tommy,<br>282344@dadeschools.net     |
| Literacy Coaches will create a school wide small group schedule and follow up with all teachers in the classrooms to ensure small group instruction is taking place.                   | McIntosh, Shekinah,<br>smcintosh@dadeschools.net |
| Both literacy coaches will conduct coach teacher collaboration based on teacher needs to help increase student success.  | Richarson, Tommy, trich@dadeschools.net          |

## **Title I Requirements**

## Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4)) List the school's webpage\* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The school will utilize multiple modes of dissimentating SIP, UniSIG budget, and SWP to stakeholders in plain language through EESAC Meetings, Wesbites, Parent Data Chat, School Messenger and Parent-Nights.

https://meekwestviewk8.org/

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))

The school plans to build positive relationships with our parents/families and surrounding community via Back to School Nights, Parent Engagement Nights, Literacy Nights, Multi-Cultural Night, Black History Night, and Autism Walk will all be utilized to build strong relationships with all stakeholders. https://meekwestviewk8.org/

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))

At Carrie P. Meek we have 5 instructional coaches to support the school in content areas to strengthen the academic programs. Administration attends common planning to ensure teachers and coaches are planning for academic student success for benchmark mastery. Administration consistently conducts walkthroughs and give teachers and coaches feedback on next steps to ensure that all academic programs school wide is implemented with fidelity. Administration conducts weekly Instructional Leadership Team Meetings to ensure instructional time is intentional and accounted for from bell to bell. Instructional coaches attend professional developments and share best practices from professional developments with teachers to ensure curriculum is enriched. Coaches and teachers plan for small group instruction to align data and resources and making sure instructional practices are enhanced in all content areas.

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))

Instructional support is given to the school Head Start program at Carrie P. Meek. Stakeholders meet to devise a plan of support for students participating in the Head Start program. ESSA funds are allocated to support tutoring and enrichment for the school site afterschool program. We consistently collaborate with Project Upstart to support families experiencing challenges to support their family.

## 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)(I))

The school currently employs a trust counselor and a student services support specialist along with mental health coordinator, and two Community Based Mental Health providers that work in tandem to align resources for the betterment of the Carrie P. Meek/Westview K-8 student body. These resources include, but are not limited, clubs, site-based referrals, peer-to-peer counseling, RJP circles, grief counseling sessions, behavior management sessions, conflict-resolution skills building, and multiple engaging campaigns to assist with building student capacity. These strategies take place before, after and during school hours and can include the parent's participation if merited.

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))

Students are exposed and educated on post-secondary opportunities through articulation fairs and technical college fairs hosted by the career and technical education departments. The main goal of these events as it relates to our students is to create an experience that can help to expose our middle school students to the possibilities of post-secondary education.

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).

Expectations and core values are clearly communicated to all stakeholders via first day of school, openhouse and grade level meetings. A review of the student/parent contract is conducted. School incentives and a rewards system are in place to enhance model behavior. Other clubs and extracurricular activities are utilized to reinforce model students and incentivize their behavior. Deans of students help to emphasize the importance of these goals in relation to the various expectations and student code of conduct.

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))

Professional learning is done through collaborative planning, coaching support, faculty meetings that include master learning plan points, and distribution of various PD's as noted on each individual DPGT plan. Recruiting for personnel is done on district websites, social websites, and word-of-mouth. Staff are retained through constant recognition and reaffirming. Additionally, support is provided for each of the teachers to ensure synergistic moments have the opportunity to take place with all stakeholders. This support helps in the high needs areas as they are often teachers who need assistance due to student behavior that is often manifested due to low scores or skill level.

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))

Various protocols are in place to assist with this transition:
Meet the teachers event for Kindergarten,
Parent interest meeting,
Back-to-School Night,
Information Packets sent home,
Promotional Event,
Early Childhood Presentations,
and Cafeteria and Coffee involvement event.

# **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: Collaborative Planning       | \$0.00 |
|---|--------|---|--------|
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Attendance | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science                      | \$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