

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Kinloch Park Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	25
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

Kinloch Park Middle School

4340 NW 3RD ST, Miami, FL 33126

<http://kpms.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.

To provide each student with a diverse education in a safe environment that promotes self-discipline, motivation, and strong academic skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kinloch Park Middle School will provide the highest quality of education for every child through collaboration and communication with all stakeholders.

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
COTO-GONZALEZ, SYLVIA	Principal	The principal's main role is to oversee the daily activities and operations of a school, including, but not limited to building maintenance, instructional and non-instructional personnel, assessing teaching methods, monitoring student achievement and discipline, administering the budget, evaluating staff, and ensure implementation of District policies and procedures.
Hewitt, Desiree	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal's main responsibility is to oversee the daily physical operations of a school, including but not limited to ensuring coverage for instructional and non-instructional personnel, building maintenance, monitoring student discipline and achievement, and bridging community relations with all stakeholders.
Bonce, Carmen	Reading Coach	The Academic Reading Coach is responsible for providing school-wide professional developments using reading strategies and Best Practices, implementing the coaching cycle for targeted teachers, providing and interpreting current data to all instructional staff, working with all Intensive Reading and Language Arts teachers, and providing students with push-in and pull-out tutoring.
Gardner, Robert	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Gardner is the Science Department Chair and the 8th-grade science teacher and is responsible for meeting with science teachers to ensure all teachers are developing lesson plans that follow the pacing guides and target the grade-level benchmarks. He is also responsible for evaluating the baseline and mid-term science data with each teacher to develop strategies and DI instruction for the areas of deficiency. Mr. Gardner also serves as our ESSAC Chair and 8th-grade Team Leader.
Sabillon, Eduardo	School Counselor	Mr. Sabillon serves as a bridge between school and mental health organizations and resources outside of school. He also manages a student load where he follows a cohort of students academic and disciplinary plan for the three years.
Roine, Maritza	Teacher, ESE	As the ESE coordinator, Mrs. Roine maintains Individual Educational Plan (IEP) documents and plans, coordinates, conducts and/or facilitates IEP Team meetings, IEP annual reviews and 3-year evaluations for a caseload of students with disabilities

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The school conducts monthly EESAC meetings to ensure that all stakeholders are informed of the SIP goals and are involved in the development of it. They also review necessary updates.

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 school will review and revise the SIP as mandated by the timeline provided. We will also review the plan and goals after every major FAST administration to provide our students with support and develop and adjust or interventions through the year to meet our students needs and increase student achievement.

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 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	100%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	97%
Charter School	No
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	33	45	105
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	8
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	12	29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	157	152	459
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	97	91	293
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	180	200	198	578
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	102	102	97	301

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	2	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	5

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	25	25	36	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	14	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5	4	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	3	5	32
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	72	89	232
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	96	97	299
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	100	120	313
	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	80	83	89	252

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	1	5	1	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3

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	25	25	36	86
One or more suspensions		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	14	34
Course failure in ELA		0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5	4	29
Course failure in Math		0	0	0	0	0	0	24	3	5	32
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment		0	0	0	0	0	0	71	72	89	232
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment		0	0	0	0	0	0	106	96	97	299
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		0	0	0	0	0	0	93	100	120	313
		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	80	83	89	252

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	1	5	1	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3

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*	38	56	49	35	55	50	28		
ELA Learning Gains				50			36		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			35		
Math Achievement*	43	60	56	33	43	36	20		
Math Learning Gains				61			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			45		
Science Achievement*	39	55	49	15	54	53	18		
Social Studies Achievement*	59	72	68	58	64	58	34		
Middle School Acceleration	62	74	73	60	56	49	48		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					73	70			
ELP Progress	59	50	40	68	77	76	47		

* 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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	300
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
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	21	Yes	4	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	50			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	48			

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	32	Yes	3	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	49			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	49			

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	38			43			39	59	62			59
SWD	12			18			9	45			4	
ELL	26			35			26	48	61		6	59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	38			43			39	59	62		6	59
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	36			42			41	59	58		6	52

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	35	50	46	33	61	62	15	58	60			68
SWD	14	45	57	15	53	49	3	22				
ELL	27	48	45	27	59	62	8	51	52			68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	35	51	46	32	61	62	14	58	61			68
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	35	50	46	33	62	62	15	58	59			67

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	28	36	35	20	32	45	18	34	48			47
SWD	11	22	18	11	22	25	9	20				18
ELL	22	34	36	17	31	43	11	29	38			47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	28	36	36	20	32	46	19	33	48			47
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	29	36	33	20	33	45	18	34	47			48

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	26%	50%	-24%	47%	-21%
08	2023 - Spring	28%	51%	-23%	47%	-19%
06	2023 - Spring	17%	50%	-33%	47%	-30%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	27%	58%	-31%	54%	-27%
07	2023 - Spring	38%	48%	-10%	48%	-10%
08	2023 - Spring	43%	59%	-16%	55%	-12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	24%	40%	-16%	44%	-20%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	56%	21%	50%	27%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	52%	20%	48%	24%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	65%	10%	63%	12%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	40%	68%	-28%	66%	-26%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The data component with the lowest performance was 6th-grade reading at 25.70 percent proficiency. This group of students came in with very low attention spans and essential reading and writing skills. These deficiencies may have been attributed to them being third and fourth graders during the two years of the Covid pandemic, where instruction was mainly online and there were no retentions for third or fourth grades.

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

The only data component that showed any decline was the Civic EOC with a decrease of 1.1 percentage points from 2022. One factor that may have contributed to this decline was that we had a new teacher teaching civics, so their lack of experience may have caused a lower number of proficient students.

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 that had the greatest gap compared to the state average is 6th grade reading. Based on the 2023 FAST PM3, our school's proficiency rate was 25.70, while the state's proficiency rate was 47 percent, a 22 percentage points gap. This gap is again explained by the fact that these students were third and fourth graders during the pandemic and mostly received online instruction, and those students who were not performing at grade level in reading were not retained for remediation.

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

Although still low compared to the state and district proficiency rates (44% and 40% respectively), our science proficiency scores increased from 15 percent in 2022 to 32.7% in 2023, a 17.7 percentage points increase. This increase was due in part to the implementation of research classes for our level 3s and 4s, providing science intervention through our 8th-grade EDGE classes, and adding a Spiral Curriculum in science.

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

According to the data points from Power BI, 12% of our school's SWD scored proficient on the 2023 ELA FAST PM3. Based on the data and the identified contributing factor of little to no evidence of differentiated instruction found in inclusion classes, we will implement differentiated instruction with fidelity in all language arts inclusion classes.

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

1. Increase the percentage of proficient 7th-grade students on the 2024 ELA BEST PM3.
2. Increase the percentage of proficient 6th grade students on the 2024 ELA Best PM3.
3. Increase the percentage of proficient SWD on the 2024 ELA BEST PM3.
4. Continue to increase the proficiency percentage on the 2024 Science FFSA.
5. Increase the proficiency percentage on the 2024 Civics EOC.

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 2022-2023 FAST PM3, 25.70% of 6th-grade students were proficient in ELA as compared to 50% for the district, and 47% for the state. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of lacking engagement and basic grade-level skills as evidenced by 68% of our 6th-grade students scoring at a level 1. As a result, we will implement the Reciprocal Teaching reading strategy which has been proven to help students stay engaged and improve basic reading comprehension.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Reciprocal Teaching reading strategy, our rising 7th grade students will increase 5 percentage points on the 2023-2024 FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

The Academic Reading Coach, will develop and present Part I of the Reciprocal Teaching reading strategy professional development to all teachers. Teachers will then take those skills back to their classrooms and develop lessons that incorporate Reciprocal Teaching. Administration and the Academic Reading Coach will conduct walk-throughs to ensure the practice is being implemented and to identify where intervention might be needed through modeling and lesson planning support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

SYLVIA COTO-GONZALEZ (pr6331@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.)

Reciprocal Teaching is a process developed by Palincsar & Brown (1984) where the role of "educator" is slowly passed from teacher to student, as students lead peer discussions and practice using four critical reading strategies: Predicting, Clarifying, Question Generating, Summarizing. Reciprocal Teaching is also known as Peer Learning. Peer Learning is a technique, in which students develop strong oral language skills as they work together to improve their reading comprehension. The purpose of this technique is 1) To encourage students to think about what they are reading and their thought process. 2) To allow students to collaborate with each other to gain a better understanding of a text. 3) To teach students to be actively involved in monitoring their comprehension. 4) To teach students to ask questions during reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With Reciprocal Teaching, teachers can chunk longer, rigorous text into smaller, more manageable pieces allowing students to interact with the text more often, keeping them engaged and improving comprehension sooner rather than waiting until the end of the text.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The Literacy Coach will propose and present a Reciprocal Teaching professional development for the entire faculty, focusing on the teacher-led part of the strategy.

Person Responsible: Carmen Bonce (carbon92@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14th-September 29th

After attending the Reciprocal Teaching professional development, teachers will develop lessons incorporating the strategy. The Literacy Coach will be available to assist with lesson planning and delivery.

Person Responsible: Carmen Bonce (carbon92@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14th-September 29th

Administration will conduct walk-throughs ensuring that teachers are incorporating the Reciprocal Teaching strategy, and notifying the Literacy Coach where assistance is needed.

Person Responsible: SYLVIA COTO-GONZALEZ (pr6331@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14th-September 29th

#2. 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.

According to the data points from Power BI, 12% of our school's SWD scored proficient on the 2023 ELA FAST PM3. Based on the data and the identified contributing factor of little to no evidence of differentiated instruction found in inclusion classes, we will implement differentiated instruction with fidelity in all language arts inclusion classes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the Differentiated Instruction instructional practice being implemented in all language arts inclusion classes, our SWD subgroup will increase by 8 percentage points on the 2024 ELA FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

With the help of our school's Literacy Coach and the Curriculum Support Staff assigned by the district, language arts and inclusion SPED teachers will develop DI groups and lessons for all inclusion classes based on the 2023 ELA FAST PM3.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

SYLVIA COTO-GONZALEZ (pr6331@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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By differentiating instruction with our SWD, teachers can ensure these students are getting targeted instruction in a small, individualized group setting allowing for a higher probability of achieving proficiency.

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.

Using Power BI and Performance Matters, teachers with inclusion classes will analyze their students' 2023 ELA FAST PM3 data, paying special attention to SWD and creating DI groups according to the weakest benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Carmen Bonce (carbon92@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14th-September 29th

Language Arts inclusion classes will incorporate at least 20 minutes of DI in every class session assuring all students, but especially SWD, are getting the individualized instruction they need to become proficient in the B.E.S.T. standards.

Person Responsible: SYLVIA COTO-GONZALEZ (pr6331@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14th-September 29th

Language Art teacher will create an incentive program to motivate students to level up- increase their performance from FAST PM1 to PM2.

Person Responsible: Carmen Bonce (carbon92@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14th-September 29th

#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.

Based on the 2022-2023 School Climate Survey, 67% of teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement "Students generally come to my class prepared for the content I teach"(Q24). Therefore, our area of focus will concentrate on helping students achieve basic, grade-level skills through early intervention.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Before-school computer labs with teachers will be available to all students three times a week for help with reading/math computer programs. During school hours, the Literacy Coach will pull out groups of students recommended by language arts teachers for reading and writing intervention and help with class assignments. Targeted math students will also be pulled out from elective classes to receive help with math assignments. After school, students will attend Homework Hour where they will receive help with homework in all content areas.

Monitoring:

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

Students will receive daily reminders through the morning announcements about the before and after-school services available to help with homework and content area assignments. This information will also be included on the monthly school calendars which are posted on the school's website for students and parents to view. The school's Literacy Coach, the district's CSS, and the math interventionist will create a weekly calendar and daily sign-in sheet as documentation to show who they are tutoring and when it took place. Sign-in sheets will also be used to monitor before and after-school tutoring services.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

SYLVIA COTO-GONZALEZ (pr6331@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.)

Effective Use of School and District Support Personnel ensures that support personnel are available and accessible for students and families including a clearly defined process for enlisting their help. Guidance Counselors, CAP Advisors, Community Involvement Specialists, School Psychologists, Staffing Specialist, etc. have a clear understanding of the role they play in the school's success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By helping students with the skills teachers say they are lacking early on in the school year with the help of school and district interventionists, teachers will see significant improvements in how their students are better able to keep up with grade-level content material and consequently spend less time with remediation.

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.

Develop a schedule for the before-school computer lab.

Person Responsible: Desiree Hewitt (dhewitt@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14th-September 29th

The math and language arts teachers will identify students they believe need early intervention. Then, the Literacy Coach, the district's CSS, and the math interventionist will create a schedule to pull out these students during their elective class.

Person Responsible: Desiree Hewitt (dhewitt@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14th-September 29th

Choose teachers and create a schedule for the after-school Homework Hour.

Person Responsible: SYLVIA COTO-GONZALEZ (pr6331@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14th-September 29th

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2023 FSSA data, 24% of 8th-grade students are proficient in Science compared to 15% on the 2022 FSSA, a gain of 9 percentage points. This gain is still 3 percentage points shy of the 2021 proficiency rate of 27%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the continued implementation of research classes for our level 3s and 4s, science intervention through our 8th-grade EDGE classes, and a Spiral Curriculum in science, we will increase by six percentage points on the 2024 FSSA.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators will review lesson plans for indication of rigorous and hands-on lessons, along with differentiated instruction based on data results throughout the year. Data analysis of progress monitoring assessments will be discussed with the administration and the science department during common planning and followed up with a strategic plan to address areas of concern. The administration will also review and observe lessons for 8th-grade EDGE teachers assuring they are reviewing the 6th and 7th grade science standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

SYLVIA COTO-GONZALEZ (pr6331@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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiating instruction gives students of all learning abilities the opportunity to keep pace with the science benchmarks. Teachers will use the data from the midyear and unit assessment to create DI groups based on the lowest-performing benchmarks, allowing for more individualized and slower-paced instruction and greater comprehension.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The administration will conduct frequent walk-throughs/observations to ensure that our teachers are focusing on hands-on experiments that review and solidify science standards.

Person Responsible: SYLVIA COTO-GONZALEZ (pr6331@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14th-September 29th

During weekly department meetings, science teachers will discuss data findings and develop lesson plans containing differentiated instruction/ reciprocal teaching techniques for all students.

Person Responsible: Robert Gardner (rgardner@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14th-September 29th

After the baseline exam, the Science team will review the data to develop intervention groups that can meet in the morning or can be pulled out to review benchmarks that need reinforcement. The 8th grade EDGE class will also use 30 minutes every session to review those items in the 6th grade and 7th grade curriculum that will be tested.

Person Responsible: SYLVIA COTO-GONZALEZ (pr6331@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14th-September 29th

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).

Resources in the way of curriculum coaches are being provided and funded by the District to support interventions and instruction based on needs.

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

NA

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.

NA

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

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

NA

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?

NA

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

NA

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

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

kpmschools.net

We disseminate information in various ways such as sending out Title I notification flyers and holding monthly EESAC meetings. Additionally, we have the Title I annual parent meeting, opening of school orientation, and open house. Lastly, a copy is posted in the main office and parent resources center in three languages.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

kpmsschools.net we use Instagram and Twitter as part of our communication plan. We will build connections and keep all our stakeholders informed via our quarterly newsletter "Around the Park" sent to the parents via school messenger. Due to the influx of newcomer students, starting in October we will start a monthly Thursday morning parent coffee talk to help parents navigate the school system.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The school launched its first year of Cambridge applicant students this year. Those students have been placed in a cohort and a counselor and/or principal will meet with them in small groups to provide support, motivation, and encouragement. For our struggling students, listed as part of area of focus, we have developed a reading plan which will include pull out services for a very targeted group in ELA. All students in level 1 and 2 were identified and placed in a Reading class. We will support our Science and Civics departments, by providing additional support via the EDGE classes. Teacher in EDGE will circle back on challenging standards following the data, in each subject area. Lastly, the SWD target group has been identified and some students will require additional support and more hands-on learning activities to reach their goals.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Our school currently has two very experienced counselors which provide our students and families with an array of services and resources. They visit classrooms and have mini workshops to enhance student connections and decrease bullying incidents. We also have a mental health coordinator that assist with more delicate cases.

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

Our student services department prepares a well round Magnet/ High School fair which includes programs like G.T. Baker. The EDGE classes provide students three years of goal development, and career exploration/planning.

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

The MTSS plan, along with the alternative to suspension and the attendance plan have been developed to organize and provide differentiated support to all children.

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

Teachers are encouraged to attend professional developments provided by the District. Specific teachers are asked to attend certain workshop to improve their professional knowledge, competence, skills and effectiveness.

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

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No