

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# George Washington Carver Middle 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>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

# George Washington Carver Middle School

4901 LINCOLN DR, Coral Gables, FL 33133

<http://carver.dade.k12.fl.us/>

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Dade County School Board on 10/11/2023.

## SIP Authority

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

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

### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

The mission of George Washington Carver Middle School is to provide for Miami-Dade County's multicultural and multilingual population an advanced educational program. George Washington Carver Middle School will follow state standards and meet the academic standards of France, Germany, Spain, and Italy. The school will offer a curriculum to prepare students to meet the future needs of major industries, international trade, finance, and tourism.

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

Reflecting on the needs of Miami-Dade County's diverse community, George Washington Carver Middle School, Center for International Education, will prepare all students to be multilingual and multiliterate. All stakeholders of the school will implement technological innovations to enhance the strong multilingual academic program, thus ensuring each student success in the competitive environment of the 21st century. The school will provide a rigorous, diverse curriculum that meets world-class standards for a multicultural world.

### 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
Arttime, Iliana	Principal	The Principal (Iliana Arttime) oversees daily activities and operations within the school. She ensures that the state/districts academic policies and curriculum are followed, disaggregate data to promote data-driven instruction, identifies and supports rising leaders, and communicates/collaborates with stakeholders to ensure that our school community needs are being addressed.
RIVERS, SHELTON	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal (Shelton Rivers) collaborates with the principal to ensure that the school's mission and vision are being met. Additionally, he assists the principal to ensure that the overall administration of the school flows seamlessly (facility maintenance, discipline, academic engagement, teaching and learning, etc.). He also communicates/collaborates with stakeholders to ensure that our school community needs are being addressed.
Alvarez, Andrew	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal (Andrew Alvarez) collaborates with the principal to ensure that the school's mission and vision are being met. Additionally, he assists the principal to ensure that the overall administration of the school flows seamlessly (discipline, academic engagement, teaching and learning, etc.). He also communicates/collaborates with stakeholders to ensure that our school community needs are being addressed.
Bassoc, cristina	Magnet Coordinator	Assists school principal and magnet teachers with the implementation of the magnet theme program and recruitment of students. She is also involved in recruitment (organizes and disseminates information to students, parents, community, and schools), outreach activities (acts as liaison between magnet school, other schools, and community), and identifies and completes job targets as mutually agreed upon with the administration.

**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.

Our community stakeholders (school leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents, students and families, and business/community leaders) are involved in every phase of the School Improvement Process (SIP). The Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) is responsible for overseeing the implementation of the plan's components. At different phases, the leadership team, with input from the faculty, review and makes recommendations for the SIP. During EESAC meetings, the SIP is reviewed and approved to ensure that the action steps are being implemented.

**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))

In order for the SIP to be effective and implemented with fidelity, it must be monitored continuously. During various phases of the SIP, the leadership team will: seek stakeholder input, review teacher lesson plans, review student work samples, disaggregate data (i-Ready, mid-year assessments, etc.), conduct data chats. After reviewing all available data, the leadership team, in conjunction with other stakeholders, will make recommendations (i.e. add additional action steps) to ensure that we are making progress towards our intended goal(s).

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	74%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	26%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *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> (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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 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	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	13
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
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	4	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	11	7	28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	12	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	20	10	54

**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	0	1	2	2	5

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

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

**Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	9	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	8
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	16	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	11	5	32

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

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

**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	

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	9	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	8
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	16	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	11	5	32

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

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

**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*	89	56	49	92	55	50	92		
ELA Learning Gains				73			70		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				75			71		
Math Achievement*	88	60	56	92	43	36	86		
Math Learning Gains				73			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				78			48		
Science Achievement*	90	55	49	85	54	53	82		
Social Studies Achievement*	98	72	68	98	64	58	92		
Middle School Acceleration	89	74	73	90	56	49	81		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					73	70			
ELP Progress		50	40		77	76			

\* 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	91
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

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	84
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	756
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
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	77			
ELL	81			
AMI				
ASN	97			
BLK	92			
HSP	91			
MUL	92			
PAC				
WHT	91			
FRL	87			

**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	89			
ELL	78			
AMI				
ASN	96			
BLK	72			
HSP	84			
MUL	92			
PAC				
WHT	85			
FRL	81			

**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	89			88			90	98	89			
SWD	60			93							2	
ELL	75			80			82	96	70		5	
AMI												
ASN	96			100			92		100		4	
BLK	85			88				93	100		4	
HSP	89			86			92	99	88		5	
MUL	90			95			92		92		4	
PAC												
WHT	89			89			89	98	89		5	
FRL	87			80			86	98	83		5	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	92	73	75	92	73	78	85	98	90			
SWD	85	92		100	77							
ELL	80	69	72	85	73	79	63	97	86			
AMI												
ASN	95	100		100	90							
BLK	86	79	67	78	62	58	77		69			
HSP	93	72	73	92	73	80	85	98	91			
MUL	95	74		100	84			100	100			
PAC												
WHT	90	73	81	92	75	75	87	100	90			
FRL	91	69	68	88	69	72	84	99	86			

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	92	70	71	86	48	48	82	92	81			
SWD	100	73		57	43							
ELL	85	69	72	79	39	45	86	82	73			
AMI												
ASN	96	86		95	45				100			
BLK	88	67	70	79	38	58	77		69			
HSP	92	70	70	85	47	48	83	91	80			
MUL	95	81		91	62							
PAC												
WHT	91	68	74	86	52	44	80	95	83			
FRL	88	66	62	79	38	45	73	86	71			

**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
07	2023 - Spring	87%	50%	37%	47%	40%
08	2023 - Spring	90%	51%	39%	47%	43%
06	2023 - Spring	85%	50%	35%	47%	38%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	91%	58%	33%	54%	37%
08	2023 - Spring	89%	59%	30%	55%	34%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	88%	40%	48%	44%	44%

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	99%	52%	47%	48%	51%

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	98%	68%	30%	66%	32%

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Based on Progressing Monitoring 3 of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.) assessment, our lowest data point is Reading (87% proficiency). The contributing factors include a lack of fidelity in implementation of Intensive Reading curriculum, as well as not enrolling all Level 1 and Level 2 students are scheduled into an Intensive Reading class.

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

Reading proficiency declined from 92% proficient in 2022 to 87% proficient in 2023. Factors that contributed to this decline may be attributed to the following: all Level 1 and Level 2 students were not scheduled into an Intensive Reading class; lack of fidelity in implementation of Intensive Reading curriculum.

**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.**

George Washington Carver Middle School out-performed the District and the State in all tested areas. Some of the factors that contribute to our continued achievement patterns include: highly qualified teachers/teaching, providing a rigorous curriculum for all students, offering extended learning opportunities.

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

Science proficiency improved from 85% (2022) to 88% (2023). One of the factors that may have contributed to this 3-percentage points increase is as follows: testing of 7th graders enrolled in Physical Science.

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

The Early Warning Signs (EWS) data indicated that 62 Students had 15 or more absences; 101 students had 10-14 absences.

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

Academic- reach and maintain at least 90 to 95% Proficient in all areas. This requires immediate attention to Reading and Science. Additionally, we would like to decrease the number of students with 15 or more absences, as well as those with 10-14 absences.

#### Area of Focus

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



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

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

According to the 2022-23 Three Year Trend (F.A.S.T. / FSA / EOC) Proficiency data, 87% of all students were proficient in ELA as compared to 92% of all students in the previous school year. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors - new state standards, new state testing format - we will implement the target elements of Benchmark-aligned instruction and differentiation.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

With the implementation of Benchmark-aligned instruction and differentiation, we expect to increase the percent of proficient students in ELA by 4-percentage points as evidenced by the F.A.S.T. results (PM-3; May 31, 2024).

**Monitoring:**

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

The Leadership Team will conduct data chats after District and state assessments with teachers. Teachers will conduct data chats with their classes / students so that instruction is data-driven (acceleration and/or remediation). The Leadership Team will conduct walkthroughs to ensure that meaningful, relevant instruction is taking place, review student work samples, review teachers lesson plans and provide timely feedback.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Iliana Artime (pr6071@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.)

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

Data-Driven Instruction is an educational approach that relies on the teacher's use of student performance data to inform instructional planning and delivery. This systematic approach of instruction uses assessment, analysis, and actions to meet students needs. Data-Driven Instruction may include developing Instructional Focus Calendars (IFC) to inform teachers on specific standards to target during instruction throughout the year, based on data outcomes.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Leadership Team will ensure that teachers implement differentiated instruction and data-driven instruction to plan lessons and deliver instruction that is aligned to the state standards/benchmarks and maximize 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.

08/24-09/29 - Facilitate weekly common planning / department meetings. As a result, teachers will have opportunities to discuss pacing guides, examine data, and share best practices.

**Person Responsible:** Iliana Arttime (pr6071@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 09/29

08/24-09/29 - Facilitate vertical planning opportunities. As a result, instructors that teach different grade levels will have opportunities to discuss pacing and student data.

**Person Responsible:** Iliana Arttime (pr6071@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 09/29

08/24-09/29 - Administrators will conduct walkthroughs, which includes reviewing teacher lesson plans. As a result, administrators and teachers will be able to ensure that purposeful, meaningful, student-centered instruction is occurring.

**Person Responsible:** Iliana Arttime (pr6071@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 09/29

**#2. 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 2022-23 Three Year Trend (F.A.S.T. / FSA / EOC) Proficiency data, 90% of all students were proficient in Math as compared to 93% of all students in the previous school year. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors - new state standards, new state testing format - we will implement the target elements of Benchmark-aligned instruction and differentiation.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

With the implementation of Benchmark-aligned instruction and differentiation, we expect to increase the percent of proficient students in Math by 3-percentage points as evidenced by the F.A.S.T. results (PM-3; May 31, 2024).

**Monitoring:**

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

The Leadership Team will conduct data chats after District and state assessments with teachers. Teachers will conduct data chats with their classes / students so that instruction is data-driven (acceleration and/or remediation). The Leadership Team will conduct walkthroughs to ensure that meaningful, relevant instruction is taking place, review student work samples, review teachers lesson plans and provide timely feedback.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Iliana Artime (pr6071@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.)

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

Data-Driven Instruction is an educational approach that relies on the teacher's use of student performance data to inform instructional planning and delivery. This systematic approach of instruction uses assessment, analysis, and actions to meet students' needs. Data-Driven Instruction may include developing Instructional Focus Calendars (IFC) to inform teachers on specific standards to target during instruction throughout the year, based on data outcomes.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Leadership Team will ensure that teachers implement differentiated instruction and data-driven instruction to plan lessons and deliver instruction that are aligned to the state standards/benchmarks and maximize 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.

08/24-09/29 - Facilitate weekly common planning / department meetings. As a result, teachers will have opportunities to discuss pacing guides, examine data, and share best practices.

**Person Responsible:** Iliana Arttime (pr6071@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 09/29

08/24-09/29 - Facilitate vertical planning opportunities. As a result, instructors that teach different grade levels will have opportunities to discuss pacing and student data.

**Person Responsible:** Iliana Arttime (pr6071@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 09/29

08/24-09/29 - Administrators will conduct walkthroughs, which includes reviewing teacher lesson plans. As a result, administrators and teachers will be able to ensure that purposeful, meaningful, student-centered instruction is occurring.

**Person Responsible:** Iliana Arttime (pr6071@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 09/29

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2022-23 School Climate Survey results, 35% of staff agreed that "Adequate disciplinary measures are used to deal with disruptive behaviors" as compared to 82% in 21-22. In an effort to increase the percentage in this category, we will implement strategies from the Positive Behavior Support (PBS) model.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

With the implementation of Positive Behavior Support (PBS) and a comprehensive, school-wide plan to address discipline / behavioral issues, we aim to reduce the number of disruptive behaviors, using available reports (Early Warning Signs, suspension reports, etc.) and increase the percentage of staff that agree with the disciplinary measures used to deal with disruptive behaviors by 5-percentage as evidenced by the 2024 School Climate Survey results.

**Monitoring:**

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

The Leadership Team will meet weekly to discuss discipline / behavioral issues and ensure progressive discipline, as outlined in the school's plan, is being implemented with fidelity. The Leadership Team will also meet with the Student Services Department to ensure that services are being provided (as necessary) to assist students and families with academic or personal areas of concern. The Leadership Team will also provide a forum for teachers to discuss behavioral concerns.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Iliana Artime (pr6071@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.)

Positive Behavior Support (PBS) is one of the foremost advances in schoolwide discipline. Also, it is the emphasis on schoolwide systems of support that include proactive strategies for defining, teaching, and supporting appropriate student behaviors to create positive school environments. Instead of using a piecemeal approach of individual behavioral management plans, a continuum of PBS for all students within a school is implemented in areas including the classroom and non-classroom settings (such as hallways, buses, and restrooms). PBS is an application of a behaviorally-based systems approach to enhance the capacity of schools, families, and communities to design effective environments that improve the link between research-validated practices and the environments in which teaching and learning occurs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Leadership Team will implement Positive Behavior Support (PBS) to improve and integrate data, systems, and practices to affect positive student outcomes.

**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.

08/24-09/29 - Develop a school-wide, progressive discipline plan. As a result, there will be a uniform method as to how progressive discipline will be implemented.

**Person Responsible:** Iliana Arttime (pr6071@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 09/29

08/24-09/29 - Facilitate grade level orientation for all students. As a result, students will be provided the specific of behavioral expectations and the consequences for not following the Code of Student Conduct.

**Person Responsible:** Iliana Arttime (pr6071@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 09/29

08/24-09/29 - Ensure that all teachers have a clear and concise set of classroom rules. As a result, students will garner an understanding of each teacher's expectations.

**Person Responsible:** Iliana Arttime (pr6071@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 09/29

**#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2022-23 Student Attendance - 3 Year Comparison, 62% of student were absent 0 - 5 times, as compared to 51% during the 2021-22 school year. In an effort to reduce the percentage in this category, we will use strategic attendance initiatives and implement strategies outlined in our attendance plan.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

With the implementation of Strategic Attendance Initiatives and strategies from our attendance plan, we aim to reduce the percentage of students absent 0 - 5 times by 4-percentage points as evidenced by daily available reports (Early Warning Signs, daily attendance bulletins, etc.).

**Monitoring:**

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

The Leadership Team will monitor this area of focus by ensuring that teachers are recording attendance accurately, reviewing daily attendance records, providing support to students and families (as needed).

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Iliana Artime (pr6071@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

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

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Leadership Team will implement Strategic Attendance Initiatives to positively affect overall student attendance; reduce the number of students with excessive absences.

**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.

08/24-09/29 - Ensure that teachers are familiar with the attendance procedure as prescribed by the District. As a result, the entire staff will use the same procedures to document student attendance.

**Person Responsible:** Iliana Artime (pr6071@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 09/29

08/24-09/29 - Ensure that daily attendance is recorded timely, accurately, as prescribed by the District. As a result, school-wide attendance will be reviewed and uploaded to the District; reducing the number of errors that are not aligned to the District's policy.

**Person Responsible:** Iliana Artime (pr6071@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 09/29

08/24-09/29 - Develop a comprehensive attendance action plan, that includes support from various stakeholders (teachers, Guidance Counselors, Social Worker). As a result, the school will have a plan that focuses on student attendance that include specific actions/interventions based on students' absences and/or tardies.

**Person Responsible:** Iliana Artime (pr6071@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 09/29