

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Winston Park K 8 Center School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>15</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>24</b> |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>24</b> |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>26</b> |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>28</b> |

# Winston Park K 8 Center

13200 SW 79TH ST, Miami, FL 33183

<http://winstonpark.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),<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 Winston Park K-8 Center is to create a fair and equitable learning environment in which all students strive for personal and academic excellence in a “family-centered” atmosphere as they develop skills to become lifelong learners and successful participants in a global community.

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

Winston Park K-8 Center successfully educates and prepares students from multicultural backgrounds to make economic, political, moral and social decisions that will positively impact 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  |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Rivas, Carla        | Principal           | Manage the operations and the educational programs of the school.                        |
| Castellanos, Ashley | Assistant Principal | Monitor educational programs of the school.  |
| Llama, Marlene      | Instructional Coach | Review data and meet with teachers.  |
| Guzman, Patricia    | Teacher, K-12       | Facilitates communication between administration and 6-8 teachers.                       |
| Hernandez, Diana    | Teacher, K-12       | Facilitates communication between administration and Pre-K through first grade teachers. |
| Guitian, Sue        | Teacher, K-12       | Facilitates communication between administration and science department.                 |

**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.

We have an active EESAC and PTSA that includes community members, parents, teachers, and students in all school based decisions. Phone calls, emails, website, and flyers are used to invite members to join our school committees.

**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))

We will begin by reviewing the SIP with all stakeholders and revisiting it at all EESAC meetings and include teachers in the action plan revisions during each phase.

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>PK-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | No   |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 97%  |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 81%  |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No   |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | No   |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | N/A  |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)<br>English Language Learners (ELL)<br>Asian Students (ASN)<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  | 2021-22: A<br>2019-20: A<br>2018-19: A<br>2017-18: A   |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |  |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>   |  |

**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           | 11 | 4 | 6  | 16 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 9  | 81    |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 10 | 12    |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 0  | 5 | 4  | 1  | 1  | 0  | 2  | 0  | 13    |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0  | 1 | 1  | 4  | 7  | 11 | 2  | 14 | 40    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 2  | 15 | 24 | 18 | 30 | 24 | 113   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7  | 2  | 24 | 33    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0  | 8 | 13 | 22 | 34 | 32 | 41 | 61 | 211   |

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 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 19 | 57    |

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           | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 13    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7     |

**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   | 20          | 4 | 3 | 1  | 4  | 10 | 6  | 5  | 19 | 72    |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5  | 4  | 9     |
| Course failure in ELA   | 2           | 2 | 2 | 0  | 1  | 1  | 0  | 2  | 0  | 10    |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14 | 7  | 21    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 15 | 26 | 18 | 29 | 20 | 21 | 129   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 6  | 5  | 12 | 18 | 8  | 16 | 65    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 2 | 8 | 15 | 21 | 22 | 32 | 35 | 43 | 178   |

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 | 2           | 2 | 17 | 1 | 9 | 15 | 14 | 2 | 38 | 100   |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 2           | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6     |

**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   | 20          | 4 | 3 | 1  | 4  | 10 | 6  | 5  | 19 | 72    |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5  | 4  | 9     |
| Course failure in ELA   | 2           | 2 | 2 | 0  | 1  | 1  | 0  | 2  | 0  | 10    |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14 | 7  | 21    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 15 | 26 | 18 | 29 | 20 | 21 | 129   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 6  | 5  | 12 | 18 | 8  | 16 | 65    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 2 | 8 | 15 | 21 | 22 | 32 | 35 | 43 | 178   |

**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 | 2           | 2 | 17 | 1 | 9 | 15 | 14 | 2 | 38 | 100   |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 2           | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6     |

**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*                | 61     | 61       | 53    | 69     | 62       | 55    | 66     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              |        |          |       | 63     |          |       | 53     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      |        |          |       | 47     |          |       | 42     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 70     | 63       | 55    | 72     | 51       | 42    | 58     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             |        |          |       | 69     |          |       | 25     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     |        |          |       | 63     |          |       | 23     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 52     | 56       | 52    | 61     | 60       | 54    | 53     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     | 80     | 77       | 68    | 85     | 68       | 59    | 70     |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      | 65     | 75       | 70    | 82     | 61       | 51    | 62     |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        | 76       | 74    |        | 53       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        | 73       | 53    |        | 78       | 70    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    | 62     | 62       | 55    | 57     | 75       | 70    | 68     |          |       |

\* 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           | 64  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 0   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 450 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 7   |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Percent Tested             | 100 |
| Graduation Rate            |     |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |     |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 67  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 0   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 668 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 10  |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100 |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

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

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY |                                 |                    |   |   |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup                      | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD                                | 44                              |                    |   |   |
| ELL                                | 54                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 64                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 60                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                | 59                              |                    |   |   |

| 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                                | 49                              |                    |   |   |
| ELL                                | 59                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                | 81                              |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 44                              |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 67                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 60                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                | 65                              |                    |   |   |

**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                                   | 61       |        |             | 70        |         |              | 52       | 80      | 65        |                   |                     | 62           |
| SWD  | 35       |        |             | 48        |         |              | 33       | 60      | 42        |                   | 7                   | 54           |
| ELL  | 44       |        |             | 61        |         |              | 33       | 67      | 54        |                   | 7                   | 62           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 61       |        |             | 70        |         |              | 52       | 80      | 65        |                   | 7                   | 62           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 59       |        |             | 63        |         |              | 57       |         |           |                   | 3                   |              |
| FRL  | 56       |        |             | 64        |         |              | 48       | 72      | 57        |                   | 7                   | 66           |

| 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                                   | 69       | 63     | 47          | 72        | 69      | 63           | 61       | 85      | 82        |                   |                     | 57           |
| SWD  | 44       | 51     | 37          | 45        | 56      | 58           | 38       | 72      |           |                   |                     | 36           |
| ELL  | 60       | 57     | 48          | 65        | 63      | 59           | 47       | 71      | 67        |                   |                     | 57           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 82       |        |             | 80        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 43       | 27     |             | 50        | 55      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 69       | 64     | 48          | 72        | 69      | 63           | 62       | 85      | 84        |                   |                     | 56           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 66       | 56     |             | 69        | 72      |              | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 65       | 61     | 47          | 67        | 65      | 63           | 55       | 86      | 76        |                   |                     | 60           |

| 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                                   | 66       | 53     | 42          | 58        | 25      | 23           | 53       | 70      | 62        |                   |                     | 68           |
| SWD  | 37       | 35     | 31          | 34        | 20      | 15           | 26       | 65      | 32        |                   |                     | 43           |
| ELL  | 54       | 53     | 46          | 49        | 24      | 24           | 35       | 64      | 47        |                   |                     | 68           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 60       |        |             | 50        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 33       |        |             | 50        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 66       | 53     | 43          | 57        | 24      | 22           | 53       | 69      | 62        |                   |                     | 68           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 64       | 47     |             | 61        | 37      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 62       | 50     | 40          | 53        | 22      | 23           | 50       | 61      | 63        |                   |                     | 66           |

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

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

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

| ELA   |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 58%    | 56%      | 2%                         | 54%   | 4%                      |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 54%    | 50%      | 4%                         | 47%   | 7%                      |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 59%    | 51%      | 8%                         | 47%   | 12%                     |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 65%    | 58%      | 7%                         | 58%   | 7%                      |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 46%    | 50%      | -4%                        | 47%   | -1%                     |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 53%    | 52%      | 1%                         | 50%   | 3%                      |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 45%    | 58%      | -13%                       | 54%   | -9%                     |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 52%    | 48%      | 4%                         | 48%   | 4%                      |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 76%    | 63%      | 13%                        | 59%   | 17%                     |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 73%    | 64%      | 9%                         | 61%   | 12%                     |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 85%    | 59%      | 26%                        | 55%   | 30%                     |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 59%    | 58%      | 1%                         | 55%   | 4%                      |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08      | 2023 - Spring | 51%    | 40%      | 11%                        | 44%   | 7%                      |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 38%    | 50%      | -12%                       | 51%   | -13%                    |

| ALGEBRA |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A     | 2023 - Spring | 96%    | 56%      | 40%                        | 50%   | 46%                     |

| GEOMETRY |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade    | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A      | 2023 - Spring | 96%    | 52%      | 44%                        | 48%   | 48%                     |

| BIOLOGY |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A     | 2023 - Spring | 93%    | 65%      | 28%                        | 63%   | 30%                     |

| CIVICS |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade  | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A    | 2023 - Spring | 72%    | 68%      | 4%                         | 66%   | 6%                      |

### 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.**

Lowest performance was in sixth grade math at 45% proficiency. The contributing factor would be that we had changes in personnel.

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

The data component with the greatest decrease is sixth grade math, which had a 24% decrease from the 2022-2023 school year. One of the contributing factors would be teachers new to the grade level.

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

The greatest gaps when compared to the state average was in sixth grade math and fifth grade science with the state scoring 58 and 51 percentage points of students on or above grade level respectively, while WPK8 scored 45 and 38 percentage points on or above grade level. The contributing factor would be due to the personnel changes in the science classes.

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

Eighth grade Math showed the most improvement going from 28% to 85%. We believe the increase is due to a change in teacher placement.

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

Some of the potential areas of concern would be proficiency of our ESE and ELL subgroups in all grade levels as, well as monitoring the incoming ELL and ESE students who continue to enroll at our school.

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

Our highest priority for school improvement is in sixth grade math and Science school-wide. We would like all grade levels to create a “Math and Science Action Plan” to address grade level standards to increase our proficiency in all areas..

**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 Science State Assessment 44% of students demonstrated proficiency in Grade 5 and 8 science. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of staff changes and challenges of having sufficient human resources in instructing students we will implement the targeted element of 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 collaborative planning, students scoring a level 3 and above will increase by a minimum of 5 percentage points as evidenced by the 2024 Spring Science State Assessments in both 5th and 8th grade.

**Monitoring:**

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

With implementation of evidenced based interventions, the Leadership Team will monitor collaborative planning by at least one member attending the bi-weekly grade level and department meetings and will collect signed meeting agendas and attendance rosters.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Marlene Llana (mllama@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.)

Standards-Based Collaborative Planning refers to any period of time that is scheduled during the school day for multiple teachers, or teams of teachers, to work together. Its primary purpose is to bring teachers together to learn from one another and collaborate on projects that will lead to improvements in standards-aligned lesson quality, instructional effectiveness, and student achievement. Standards-Based lessons should include detailed objectives, activities and assessments that evaluate students on the aligned standards based content. Collaborative Planning improves collaboration among teachers and promotes learning, insights, and constructive feedback that occur during professional discussions among teachers. Standards-Based lessons, units, materials, and resources are improved when teachers work on them collaboratively.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Standards-Based Collaborative Planning brings teachers together to learn from one another and collaborate on projects that will lead to improvements in instructional effectiveness and student achievement.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 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.

A teacher team will review student data to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses and begin to create an action plan. The Leadership team will review the data.

**Person Responsible:** Marlene Llana (mllana@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 08/17/2023 - 9/29/23

Administration will work together to create a schedule that is conducive to common planning. The expected outcome of this action step is to allow teachers more time to compare student data, instructional practices, and align instructional planning to the needs of their students.

**Person Responsible:** Carla Rivas (pr5961@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 08/17/23 - 9/29/23

Teachers will meet with their grade level/department bi-weekly.

**Person Responsible:** Carla Rivas (pr5961@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23 - 9/29/23

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2023 FAST ELA Assessment 56% of students demonstrated proficiency in Grade 3-8 ELA. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of staff changes and challenges of having sufficient human resources in instructing students, we will implement the targeted element of ELA.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If we successfully implement academic vocabulary instruction, then students scoring a level 3 and above will increase by a minimum of 5 percentage points as evidenced by the 2024 ELA FAST Assessments in grades 3-8.

**Monitoring:**

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

With implementation of evidenced based interventions, the Leadership Team will monitor academic vocabulary instruction with weekly walkthroughs and monitoring vocabulary through i-Ready and Wordly Wise work samples.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Carla Rivas (pr5961@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.)

Academic Vocabulary Instruction plays a critical role in improving vocabulary skills for all learners. Academic Vocabulary should be incorporated through effective lessons in a myriad of ways including the use of interactive journals, interactive word walls, exposure to diverse texts, visual stimuli, incorporation into daily dialogue, etc., and associated with the content being taught.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Vocabulary continues to be a low strand. We purchased Wordly Wise for teachers to assist with teaching and monitoring student vocabulary development.

**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.

Weekly ELA walkthroughs will be conducted by the assistant principals: Cedric Ward (grades 3-5) and by Ashley Castellanos (grades 6-8). Administrators will record findings and conduct follow-up meetings with ELA teachers to ensure high quality instruction pertaining to vocabulary is taking place.

**Person Responsible:** Carla Rivas (pr5961@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23 - 9/29/23

Grade-level and ELA department meetings will take place bi-weekly on Wednesdays. Teachers and administrators will meet to analyze student performance data in order to guide instructional planning.

**Person Responsible:** Carla Rivas (pr5961@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23 - 9/29/23

Reading intervention programs will begin in elementary grades. In grades 6-8, students placed in the intensive reading course will be closely monitored and rewarded with various activities for meeting their quarterly goals.

**Person Responsible:** Carla Rivas (pr5961@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23 - 9/29/23

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****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 Math FAST Assessment, 65% of students demonstrated proficiency in Grade 3-8 Math. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of staff changes and challenges of having sufficient human resources in instructing students, we will implement the targeted element of Math.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

With the implementation of vertical planning, students scoring a level 3 and above will increase by a minimum of 5 percentage points as evidenced by the 2024 Math FAST Assessments in grades 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8. We intend to increase our 6th grade math proficiency by 10 percentage points.

**Monitoring:**

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

With implementation of evidenced based interventions, the Leadership Team will monitor vertical planning by at least one member attending the meetings and will collect signed meeting agendas and attendance rosters.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Carla Rivas (pr5961@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.)

Collaborative Evaluation of Student Work refers to the calibration process which makes scoring student work more consistent among a group of educators and more aligned to the standards upon which rubrics and scoring criteria are based. The success of such a process is dependent on a culture in which all educators are collaborative and focused on reflective practice to improve student learning. This process is particularly relevant for grade-level or content-alike teams of teachers using common assessments as evidence for Student Learning Objectives.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborative Planning brings teachers together to learn from one another and collaborate on instructional practices that will lead to improvements in instructional effectiveness and student achievement. We will implement collaborative planning amongst grade-levels and within the math department (grades 6-8) through bi-weekly meetings on Wednesdays. Both teachers and administrators will attend collaborative planning meetings to use student data from topic assessments to guide instructional planning and improve math proficiency for grades 3-8.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

### Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers will review student data from FAST PM3 to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses and bring findings to vertical planning meetings.

**Person Responsible:** Carla Rivas (pr5961@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 08/17/23 - 9/29/23

Vertical planning meetings will be conducted during teacher common planning time.

**Person Responsible:** Carla Rivas (pr5961@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23 - 09/29/23

Administration will work together to create a schedule that is conducive to common planning.

**Person Responsible:** Carla Rivas (pr5961@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 08/17/23 - 9/29/23

#### #4. 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 the School Report Card, 95% of Hispanic students have chronic absenteeism. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of students not being motivated and engaged, we will implement the targeted element of attendance.

##### Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement the Attendance Incentive Programs, the percentage of Hispanic students on the School Report Card demonstrating chronic absenteeism will decrease by at least 5 percentage points in 2024. The grade levels we intend to target with highest priority is Kindergarten, 1st grade, and grades 6-8.

##### Monitoring:

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

Administrators and counselors will review student attendance with teachers quarterly to identify students.

##### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carla Rivas (pr5961@dadeschools.net)

##### Evidence-based Intervention:

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

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

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

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need to be motivated and engaged in the classroom on a daily basis. When they are not in school, they are not learning. By involving all stakeholders in our attendance incentive program, we will create a "buy-in" and in return, increase student attendance.

##### 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 principal will create an Attendance Team to communicate and establish incentives for student attendance. The attendance team will consist of the administration and each grade-level chair.

**Person Responsible:** Carla Rivas (pr5961@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23 - 09/29/23

Identified attendance leaders will provide support and development to their colleagues in various areas of tardies, excused early, excused and unexcused absences.

**Person Responsible:** Carla Rivas (pr5961@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23 - 9/29/23

Charts will be created to track tardies, and excused early students in order to monitor and identify chronic behaviors. The expected outcome is to increase student and parent awareness and accountability for their attendance; ultimately decreasing the amount of times the student is absent or leaves home early.

**Person Responsible:** Carla Rivas (pr5961@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23 - 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).

## **Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)**

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

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

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

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

N/A

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

N/A



### Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

#### Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

#### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

### Monitoring

#### Monitoring

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

N/A

#### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

### Evidence-based Practices/Programs

#### Description:

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

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

N/A

**Rationale:**

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|
|-------------|-----------------------------------|

N/A

**Title I Requirements**

**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

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

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

List the school’s webpage\* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be disseminated through EESAC and PTSA, which includes administrators, community members, parents, teachers, school staff, and students. SIP is also available online and in office at request.

**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))

WPK8 plans on continuing its positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by including them in all events such as field day, meet and greets, school tours, and monthly "Wildcat Events." Teachers will demonstrate how to access the portals, webpage, gradebook, and Schoology during Open House to ensure that they stay abreast of their child's progress.

**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))**

WPK8 created a small group of teacher leaders to desegregate data, find opportunities for improvement, and create an action plan by grade level for each Science, Math, and ELA to strengthen its academic programs and enrich and accelerate our curriculum to meet all our students' needs.

**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))**

NA

#### **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))**

WPK8 is an award winning school in the Mental Health Initiatives. Our counselor meet in school groups, and work with teachers and families to meet all students needs. They also hold monthly sessions to promote mental health such as yoga, line dance, and inspirational messages through out the school.

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

**Budget to Support Areas of Focus**

**Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus**

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

|               |        |   |               |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science                        | \$0.00        |
| 2             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA                            | \$0.00        |
| 3             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math                           | \$0.00        |
| 4             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |   | <b>\$0.00</b> |

**Budget Approval**

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No