Renaissance Middle Charter School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Renaissance Middle Charter School

8360 NW 33RD ST, Doral, FL 33122

http://www.recscharter.org

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;   2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;   3. Have a school grade of D or F; or   4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

RMCS provides world
-class educational solutions with:
• An unwavering dedication to student success • An unyielding commitment to ethical and sound business practices
Providing a choice for our stakeholders that fosters and
promotes educational excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

RMCS will have a dramatic impact on the world's next
generation by changing lives and leaving a legacy. Our
brand will be the standard by which quality is measured
in education.

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
Castellanos, Elaine	Principal	
Ganivet, Suzanne	Teacher, K-12	Discipline and operations
Montan, Ashley	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Curriculum instruction and development

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.

Several committees were formed and asked for their input in the creation of our school improvement plan. The committees consisted of our core area professional learning communities, our MTSS team, our SWD teachers, our leadership team, the parent teacher committee and our student council and peer mentors.

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

The SIP will be monitored at different data points, such as NWEA benchmarks, and FAST progress monitoring periods, bi-weekly PLC data chats, climate surveys, and we will update the SIP quarterly with information from these sources.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 5-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	97%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	22%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	28	25	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	23	16	55
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	15	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	3	14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	57	67	131
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	54	60	124
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	57	67	131

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	0	0	0	4	4	42	56	106

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2

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
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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 school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	59	56	49	56	55	50	51		
ELA Learning Gains				59			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			51		
Math Achievement*	68	60	56	62	43	36	53		
Math Learning Gains				74			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			47		
Science Achievement*	58	55	49	57	54	53	53		
Social Studies Achievement*	70	72	68	72	64	58	57		
Middle School Acceleration	90	74	73	91	56	49	65		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					73	70			
ELP Progress	51	50	40	50	77	76	61		

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	630
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	2	
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	66			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	64			

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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	96			
BLK				
HSP	62			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	59			

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	59			68			58	70	90			51
SWD	25			43			21	42			5	44
ELL	46			59			47	54	93		6	51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	59			69			57	69	90		6	52
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	73			53							2	
FRL	54			63			44	64	100		6	57

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	56	59	47	62	74	62	57	72	91			50
SWD	22	43	40	29	62	60	14	24				50
ELL	38	54	46	48	67	60	42	63	90			50
AMI												
ASN	91			100								

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK												
HSP	53	58	47	60	74	63	57	71	90			51
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	89	80		84	80		70					
FRL	44	54	49	51	71	61	42	69	91			53

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	51	51	51	53	42	47	53	57	65			61
SWD	18	31	35	18	33	36	31	31				50
ELL	39	53	58	43	45	51	39	54	59			61
AMI												
ASN	73			91								
BLK												
HSP	49	50	51	50	41	48	51	55	62			61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	68	69		74	50							
FRL	46	52	56	46	42	48	50	52	60			61

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	38%	56%	-18%	54%	-16%
07	2023 - Spring	52%	50%	2%	47%	5%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	45%	51%	-6%	47%	-2%
06	2023 - Spring	54%	50%	4%	47%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	62%	58%	4%	54%	8%
07	2023 - Spring	63%	48%	15%	48%	15%
08	2023 - Spring	66%	59%	7%	55%	11%
05	2023 - Spring	33%	58%	-25%	55%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	46%	40%	6%	44%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	17%	50%	-33%	51%	-34%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	56%	33%	50%	39%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	52%	48%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	65%	35%	63%	37%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	68%	-4%	66%	-2%

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.

Spring of 22 data shows that reading learning gains of the lowest 25% had the lowest performance. A possible contributing factor is the lack of targeted small group interventions focusing specifically with students with learning disabilities and in the lowest 25%. This is due to teacher attrition, staff turnover and new hires having a lack of experience in implementing effective teaching strategies.

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

Our reading learning gains of the lowest 25% had the greatest decline from prior year, going from 51% in 2021 to 47% in 2022. However both achievement and learning gains have improved from 6-9% points from 2021 to 2022 but are not still at 2019 levels. This indicates that we need to analyze our data and identify the lowest 25% to make sure they are receiving targeted interventions. The possible contributing factors are teacher attrition, staff turnover in ELA teachers and new hires having a lack of experience in the content area.

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 data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 7th grade students with disabilities social studies achievement, with a 17.2% point difference. The possible contributing factors are teacher attrition, staff turnover in social studies teachers and new hires having a lack of experience in the content area However, reading learning gains of the lowest 25% were low and we feel this is also a contributing factor for their low social studies score.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was math learning gains, and math learning gains of the lowest 25% and this included our students with disabilities. As compared to the state, our students with disability scored 18.3% higher in learning gains of the lowest 25%, and 16.7% higher on math learning gains. Possible contributing factors include teacher retention of highly qualified math teachers who implement targeted interventions and are masters of their content area.

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

Using the data from the early warning systems, reading is an area of concern. The data shows more students failed reading versus math and they also had a higher number of level one students in reading.

Further, when comparing 2022 achievement scores, reading proficiency had the lowest gain over the state, scoring 2.5% higher than the state versus math scoring 9.2% higher.

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

1. Students with disabilities - Reading learning gains of the lowest 25%
2. Students with disabilities - social studies achievement
3. Students with disabilities - science achievement

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Our 2022 ESSA subgroup score indicated a low federal index score of 38% for students with disabilities. After reviewing data for this specific subgroup, reading, science and social studies achievement scores were below the state scores for this subgroup.

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

By the 2024 FAST assessment, our ESSA students with disabilities will score a federal index of 41% or higher.

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

Classroom observations, data chats using classroom data during PLC with a focus on students with disabilities, and data analysis of NWEA benchmarks and FAST progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elaine Castellanos (ecastellanos@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.)

1. Tiered small group instruction
2. Cooperative learning
3. On going progress monitoring
4. Providing feedback

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

According to Robert Marzano, factors that influence student performance include high yielding teacher instructional strategies.

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.

Professional development by Solution Tree for administration and staff on targeted small group instruction and Professional Learning Communities.

Person Responsible: Elaine Castellanos (ecastellanos@dadeschools.net)

By When: August of 2023

Analyze data and identify our students with disabilities in each teacher's classroom roster. Set up small group instruction schedules, data and standard trackers

Person Responsible: Ashley Montan (amontan@recscharter.org)

By When: September of 2023

Classroom, PLC and lesson plan observations of small group instruction, cooperative learning, on going progress monitoring and providing feedback

Person Responsible: Elaine Castellanos (ecastellanos@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 2023 to June of 2024

Review mid year data and create action plans to achieve our goals

Person Responsible: Elaine Castellanos (ecastellanos@dadeschools.net)

By When: December 2023 to January 2024

Review state testing data to affirm if our goal was met and develop action plans for the next year

Person Responsible: Elaine Castellanos (ecastellanos@dadeschools.net)

By When: June 2024

#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.

Our area of focus in ELA will be the learning gains of the lowest 25%. This was identified as a crucial need due to the low scores in this category and the effect it has on our students with disabilities social studies achievement scores which were the lowest performing category in our school.

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

By the 2024 FAST assessment, our reading learning gains for the lowest 25% will be at a 53% or higher.

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

ELA classroom observations, lesson plan observations and data chats using classroom data during PLC with a focus on the lowest 25%. Furthermore a review benchmark assessments such as NWEA benchmarks and FAST progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elaine Castellanos (ecastellanos@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.)

1. Tiered small group instruction
2. Cooperative learning
3.On going progress monitoring
4. Providing feedback

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

According to Robert Marzano, factors that influence student performance include high yielding teacher instructional strategies.

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.

Professional development by Solution Tree for administration and staff on targeted small group instruction and Professional Learning Communities.

Person Responsible: Elaine Castellanos (ecastellanos@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Analyze reading data and identify our lowest 25% students in each ELA teacher's classroom roster. Review cut scores for learning gains for 2024 FAST Set up small group instruction schedules, data and standard trackers

Person Responsible: Ashley Montan (amontan@recscharter.org)

By When: September 2023

Classroom, PLC and lesson plan observations of small group instruction, cooperative learning, on going progress monitoring and providing feedback

Person Responsible: Elaine Castellanos (ecastellanos@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 2023 - June 2024

Review mid year data and create action plans to achieve our goals

Person Responsible: Elaine Castellanos (ecastellanos@dadeschools.net)

By When: December 2023 - January 2024

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Our data shows a big difference in achievement and growth scores when highly effective teachers are retained.

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

Renaissance middle will retain all highly effective teachers in social studies and ELA by the start of next school year and have exemplary spring staff surveys.

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

Staff surveys will be issued three times a year to measure retention criteria. Multiple measures such as observations, test scores and merit based pay will be used to measure the qualification of our teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elaine Castellanos (ecastellanos@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.)

Renaissance middle will implement research based teacher retention strategies such as creating a supportive working environments, providing proper training and development, implement effective communication and create recognition programs.

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

The scores of our students that have experienced highly effective teachers are much higher in both achievement and growth.

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.

Implement our leadership book study of Jon Gordon's The Energy Bus to create a supportive working environments, that shares the same vision and vocabulary to celebrate positivity and support our vision.

Person Responsible: Elaine Castellanos (ecastellanos@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Follow the model of effective change by having employees take a temperament quiz and make sure all temperaments are explained and understand the needs of each temperament. Then provide what each temperament needs - vision explained, PD, resources

Person Responsible: Elaine Castellanos (ecastellanos@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Conduct staff surveys and review results improve areas of low scores

Person Responsible: Elaine Castellanos (ecastellanos@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 2023 - June 2024

Develop highly effective teachers using weekly PLC to share best practices, analyze data, develop action plans and provide professional development

Person Responsible: Elaine Castellanos (ecastellanos@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 2023 - June 2024

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).

A team of Renaissance stakeholders reviewed academic, data, from the 2021/2022 school year specifically the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) growth and proficiency data, FSA data, and teacher classroom data. Stakeholders determined areas of needed improvement for the current school year , the team determined how ESSER grant funds should be spent to best support the indicated areas of concern.

The school will be using ESSER funds to purchase professional development on running PLCs with fidelity and small group instruction. There will be a PD for administration and for faculty and staff.

The school will be using ESSER funds for instructional aides to assist with targeted small group instruction

The school will be using ESSER funds for tutoring in all areas of need and with low performing students with disabilities

The school will be using ESSER funds to purchase educational software to target differentiation such as Lexia and Exact path