

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Thomas Jefferson Biscayne Gardens K 8 Academy



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Thomas Jefferson Biscayne Gardens K 8 Academy

525 NW 147TH ST, Miami, FL 33168

<http://jefferson.dadeschools.net/>

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Thomas Jefferson/ Biscayne Gardens K-8 Academy will develop academic skills, habits of mind, and the character traits necessary for each child to reach their full potential. Through the cooperative effort of staff, parents and the community, students are empowered to become successful life-long learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We at Thomas Jefferson Biscayne Gardens K-8 Academy believe every student can learn. We foster a learning environment focused on intellect, physical and emotional wellness, build self-esteem, and confidence to encompass the whole child.

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
Lacouty, Patrick	Principal	The role of a principal is to provide strategic direction to the school, develop standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parental involvement, revise policies and procedures, manage the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities. Other important duties entail developing safety protocols and emergency response procedures.
Fleurissant, Micheka	Assistant Principal	The role of the assistant principal is to implement the SIP and monitor the action steps as an instructional leader. The assistant principal supports the principal in providing strategic direction to the school, developing standardized curricula, assessing teaching methods, monitoring student achievement, encouraging parental involvement, revising policies and procedures, managing the budget, hiring and evaluating staff and overseeing facilities. Other important duties entail developing safety protocols and emergency response procedures.

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.

Stakeholders will be involved by conducting meetings with curriculum leaders such as instructional coaches and department chairs to include them in analyzing data and selecting strategies and implementation steps. We will ensure that all school staff are aware of the implementation steps (details, dates, and responsibilities), know the school goals, roles and the measurable outcomes. In addition, include the PTA and Student Council Advisory in the decision making progress as we progress monitor and modify plans as needed.

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 administrative team will conduct walkthroughs and analyze data from observational notes to provide timely and specific feedback. The team will also conduct departmental data chats to identify trends and make adjustments as needed. Ongoing progress monitoring will guide adjustments to instructional planning and determine benchmarks in need of spiraling. Midyear assessment data will guide the modification of targeted groups.

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

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

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	9	14	17	6	10	12	19	32	119
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	2	18	6	0	11	1	5	43
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	20	3	2	16	1	16	61
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	9	26	34	21	41	144
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	33	61	45	61	138	174	220	746

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	28	9	21	29	19	45	154

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	36	0	0	0	0	2	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	1	4	0	17	24

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	13	6	9	4	8	21	54	68	183
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	90	156
Course failure in ELA	0	0	7	14	4	4	16	23	12	80
Course failure in Math	0	1	6	6	3	4	15	29	49	113
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	11	7	29	42	78	179
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	8	11	37	39	98	199
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	8	13	20	10	47	56	101	255

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	1	3	13	8	9	30	67	128	259	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	12	0	0	1	6	0	20	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	16	3	21	

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	13	6	9	4	8	21	54	68	183	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	90	156	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	7	14	4	4	16	23	12	80	
Course failure in Math	0	1	6	6	3	4	15	29	49	113	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	11	7	29	42	78	179	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	8	11	37	39	98	199	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	8	13	20	10	47	56	101	255	

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	1	3	13	8	9	30	67	128	259	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	12	0	0	1	6	0	20	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	16	3	21	

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*	45	61	53	38	62	55	38		
ELA Learning Gains				53			37		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			28		
Math Achievement*	52	63	55	43	51	42	33		
Math Learning Gains				63			29		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			29		
Science Achievement*	41	56	52	46	60	54	43		
Social Studies Achievement*	62	77	68	61	68	59	55		
Middle School Acceleration	81	75	70	90	61	51	61		
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	52	62	55	46	75	70	43		

* 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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	546
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	58			
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	53			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	51			

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	52			
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	55			
HSP	54			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	55			

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	45			52			41	62	81			52
SWD	58			57			65	58			6	56
ELL	41			48			24	57			6	52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45			52			40	61	81		7	49
HSP	50			54			44				4	63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	47			52			42	55	80		7	48

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	38	53	47	43	63	59	46	61	90			46
SWD	44	49	38	52	63	56	63	51				
ELL	26	56	50	40	62	53	33	53				46
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	52	46	43	62	60	46	61	100			42
HSP	41	61		41	69		42	69				
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	38	54	50	43	64	58	47	61	89			46

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	38	37	28	33	29	29	43	55	61			43
SWD	52	42	40	51	43	30	43	71				
ELL	23	34	35	22	22	27	28	50				43
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	37	29	34	28	25	45	53	65			43
HSP	40	36		27	32	50	40	57				
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	37	37	29	33	28	29	43	54	59			40

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	34%	50%	-16%	47%	-13%
08	2023 - Spring	32%	51%	-19%	47%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	58%	-12%	58%	-12%
06	2023 - Spring	35%	50%	-15%	47%	-12%
03	2023 - Spring	33%	52%	-19%	50%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	59%	58%	1%	54%	5%
07	2023 - Spring	35%	48%	-13%	48%	-13%
03	2023 - Spring	46%	63%	-17%	59%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	41%	64%	-23%	61%	-20%
08	2023 - Spring	49%	59%	-10%	55%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	58%	-18%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	14%	40%	-26%	44%	-30%
05	2023 - Spring	32%	50%	-18%	51%	-19%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	56%	26%	50%	32%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	65%	29%	63%	31%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	53%	68%	-15%	66%	-13%

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.

3rd Grade ELA showed the lowest performance with a 29% proficiency. A major contributing factor was that students lacked foundational skills needed to master the 3rd grade curriculum. Based on iReady AP1, 61% of 3rd grade students lacked phonics skills while 29% struggled with high frequency words. This lack of foundational skills resulted in students struggling with grade level text.

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

3rd Grade ELA showed the greatest decline from the 21-22 to the 22-23 school year. Data from the 21-22 FSA showed 50% proficiency compared to 22-23 FAST which showed 29% proficiency, resulting in a 21 percentage point decrease. Data was impacted due to the fact that 3rd grade retainees were promoted to 4th grade midyear and their data was removed from the data set for 3rd grade.

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 gap is in the area of 4th Grade Mathematics. FAST data showed 42% proficiency compared to the state's proficiency which was 64%; a 22 percentage point difference. Additional interventions were needed to improve foundational skills of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

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

6th Grade Mathematics showed the greatest improvement from the prior year. Collaboration during common planning to unpack standards, tiered scaffold instruction, infusion of real-world application problems, and the use of IXL and practice with calculators.

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

Student attendance
Reading Deficiencies

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

3rd Grade ELA
4th Grade Math

5th and 8th Grade Science
School Wide Attendance

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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 2022-2023 FAST PM3 data, 3rd Grade ELA showed the greatest decline compared to the 2021-2022 school year. Data from the 2021-2022 FSA, showed 50% proficiency compared to 2022-2023 FAST which showed 29% proficiency, resulting in a 21-percentage point decrease. Based on the data, the identified contributing factors were that 61% of students lacked phonics skills and 29% struggled with high frequency words according to iReady AP1. The lack of foundational skills and students struggling with grade level text resulted in the of the implementation of 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.

With the implementation of an instructional practice relating to ELA, 3rd ELA proficiency will increase by 7 percentage points on the FAST PM3 by June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will conduct walkthroughs to ensure Benchmark Aligned Tier 1 instruction, differentiated instruction and appropriate intervention for Tier 2 and Tier 3 is taking place with fidelity. Academics coaches will check lesson plans for evidence of differentiation and scaffolding. The administration team will conduct weekly leadership meetings with academic coaches to monitor the progress of the implementation of differentiated instruction and provide ongoing feedback to coaches to determine teachers who need additional support. In addition, academic coaches will guide teachers in revisiting quarterly assessment data to ensure that progress is being made.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patrick Lacouty (lacouty@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.)

Differentiation and intervention will be used in pullout and push in model to support student learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiated instruction will ensure that students with varying levels of ability will receive tailored intensive instruction needed to remediate skills that students are struggling with.

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.

Instructional leaders will support ELA teachers in analyzing data from Fall 2023 PM1 to identify targeted students for remedial and intensive instruction.

Person Responsible: Natalie Charlot (316948@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29th 2023.

Instructional leaders will support teachers in planning for benchmark aligned Tier 1 instruction, differentiated instruction and appropriate intervention for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

Person Responsible: Natalie Charlot (316948@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17th -September 29th 2023.

Ongoing professional development in ELA will be provided to support teachers in implementing best practices and utilizing resources.

Person Responsible: Natalie Charlot (316948@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17th-September 29th 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2022-2023 FAST PM3 data, 42% of 4th grade students were proficient in Math as compared to the state average of 64%: a 22-percentage point difference. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of limited intervention, we will implement the targeted element of benchmark aligned instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of an instructional practice relating benchmark aligned instruction, then our 4th grade math proficiency will increase by 6 percentage points on the FAST PM3 by June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Academics coaches will check lesson plans for evidence of Benchmark Aligned planning. Administration will conduct walkthroughs to ensure Benchmark Aligned instruction. The administration team will conduct weekly leadership meetings with academic coaches to monitor the progress of the implementation of Benchmark Aligned Instruction and provide ongoing feedback to coaches to determine teachers who need additional support. In addition, academic coaches will guide teachers in revisiting quarterly assessment data to ensure that progress is being made.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patrick Lacouty (pr6281@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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

Instructional leaders will support teachers in planning for benchmark aligned instruction using BIG-M and vertical alignment to support learners.

Person Responsible: Micheka Fleurissaint (mfleurissaint@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17-September 29th 2023

Ongoing professional development in Math will be provided to support teachers in implementing best practices and utilizing resources.

Person Responsible: Micheka Fleurissaint (mfleurissaint@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17th- September 29th 2023

Administrative team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to ensure benchmark aligned planning and instruction are taking place while providing timely and specific feedback.

Person Responsible: Micheka Fleurissant (mfleurissant@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17th-September 29th 2023

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

According to the 2022-2023 Attendance record, Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of , 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 our attendance initiatives, the number of students who attend less than 90% of school days will decrease by 2 percentage points.

Monitoring:

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

Identify students with 11 or more absences during the 2023-2024 and Contact families of identified students - August 17th- September 29th, 2023.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Zenaida Cook (zd@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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

Improving accuracy of school attendance by putting systems in place such as: faculty training on attendance policies, attendance verification by teachers daily, and training clerical staff.

Person Responsible: Micheka Fleurissaint (mfleurissaint@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17-September 29, 2023

Student services team will conduct weekly ARC debriefing sessions in order to track student attendance.

Person Responsible: Zenaida Cook (zd@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17-September 29, 2023

Teachers report students who have 5 or more absences in a grading period by referring the student to Student Services with a Student Case Management Referral.

Person Responsible: Micheka Fleurissaint (mfleurissaint@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17-September 29, 2023

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

According to 2022-2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment 65 percent or more of our Kindergarten students scored below a level 3. In addition, 53% of our first graders scored below a level 3. The lack of foundational skills and students struggling with phonemic and phonological awareness resulted in the implementation of the Targeted Element of ELA.

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

According to 2022-2023 FAST PM3 69% of our 3rd grade scored below a level 3. Moreover 53% of our 4th graders scored below a level 3 while 60% of our 5th graders scored below a level 3 as well. Based on the factors of limited intervention, we will implement the targeted element of Differentiated Instruction.

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

With the implementation of an instructional practice relating to ELA, Kindergarten proficiency will increase from 35% to 40% a total of 5 percentage points on the FAST PM3 by June 2024. In addition, 1st grade proficiency will increase from 47% to 51% a total of 4 percentage points on the FAST PM3 by June 2024.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

With the implementation of an instructional practice relating to Differentiation Instruction, 3rd grade proficiency will increase from 31% to 35 a total of 4 percentage points on the FAST PM3 by June 2024. In addition, 4th grade proficiency will increase from 47% to 50% a total of 3 percentage points on the FAST PM3 by June 2024. Moreover, 5th grade proficiency will increase from 40% to 45% a total of 5 percentage points on the FAST PM3 by June 2024.

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.

Academic coaches will assist teachers in analyzing data with the goal of identifying targeted groups for intervention and differentiated instruction. Teachers will attend professional development as it relates to intervention and differentiated instruction. Administration will conduct walkthroughs to ensure that interventions and differentiation are done with fidelity. The administration team will provide teachers with timely and specific feedback. In addition, academic coaches will guide teachers in revisiting quarterly assessment data to ensure progress is being made.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Fleurissaint, Micheka , mfleurissaint@dadeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

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

Kindergarten and 1st grade students will partake in targeted interventions specifically relating to phonemic and phonological foundations.

Students in grades 3-5 will partake in Differentiation Instruction to remediate and provide intensive instruction for Tier 2 & Tier 3 students.

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?

Targeted interventions for Kindergarten and 1st grade will address the lack of foundational skills needed in order to read grade level text while Differentiated Instruction for grades 3-5 will provide tailored instruction to meet students at their needs. In addition, Differentiated Instruction will also provide teachers the opportunity to reteach benchmarks in need of spiraling to Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

<p>Assessment 09/18/23 Instructional coaches will guide teachers in analyzing their data in order to identify targeted groups for Differentiated Instruction and Intervention.</p>	<p>Fleurissaint, Micheka , mfleurissaint@dadeschools.net</p>
---	--

<p>Literacy Leadership 09/22/23 The administration team will conduct walkthroughs to ensure that Differentiated instruction and Interventions are being done with fidelity.</p>	<p>Lacouty, Patrick, lacouty@dadeschools.net</p>
--	--

<p>Professional Learning 10/04/23 Based on evidence gathered during administrative walkthrough observations, teachers will be provided with timely and specific feedback. The Administrative team will also meet with instructional coaches to identify a plan of action as it relates to professional learning based on observations.</p>	<p>Fleurissaint, Micheka , mfleurissaint@dadeschools.net</p>
---	--