Madison Middle School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Madison Middle School

3400 NW 87TH ST, Miami, FL 33147

http://madisonmiddle.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.

The faculty and staff at Madison Middle School are committed to maintaining a safe and comfortable school, where all students gain knowledge from each other and the adults who guide them. Students learn in different ways and succeed through active involvement. In our school, students' learning needs are the primary focus of all decisions. Teachers, administrators, parents, students and the community are responsible for advancing our mission, promoting mutual respect and enhancing student self-esteem to become confident, self-directed, lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Madison Middle School will develop well-rounded, confident and responsible global citizens who aspire to achieve their full potential.

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
Simons, Anthony	Principal	The following duties are included for the Principal: provides guidance and the vision for the overall performance of our school, identifies areas for improvement and leads teachers, staff, and students in making those improvements, sets academic goals and ensures students meet their learning objectives, assesses teaching methods, monitors student achievement, encourages parent involvement, revises policies and procedures, administers the budget, hires and evaluates staff, and oversees facilities.
Veras, Karen	Assistant Principal	The following duties are included for the Assistant Principal using the Principal's vision as guidance: assists with the daily operations of the school, oversees academic programs, attendance tracking, monitors the school's budget, identifies needs related to professional develop, monitors ESE compliance, provides support for Math and Literacy instruction, oversees technology needs, and performing other tasks as needed.
Frost, Barbara	Instructional Coach	The following duties are included for Instructional Coaches: plans and facilitates collaborative planning using district approved resources, analyzes and utilizes assessment data to assist teachers in planning for effective instruction, models high yield instructional strategies and lessons, assists administration in monitoring at-risk students, develops interventionists' focus calendars, and performing other tasks as needed.
Descally, Shanovia	Instructional Coach	The following duties are included for Instructional Coaches: plans and facilitates collaborative planning using district approved resources, analyzes and utilizes assessment data to assist teachers in planning for effective instruction, models high yield instructional strategies and lessons, assists administration in monitoring at-risk students, develops interventionists' focus calendars, and performs other tasks as needed.

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.

Instructional coaches and teachers were selected to participate in Synergy where planning for school improvement begins. During our Opening of Schools meeting, our entire faculty and staff convene to review the Areas of Focus and provide feedback. Finally, the first EESAC meeting will provide time to review the SIP with stakeholders, including students, parents/guardians, and community members.

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))

Our district employs the use of a SIP timeline which delineates multiple points of reflection. At those times, the School Leadership Team convenes to review qualitative and quantitative data. We discuss the effect our action steps have had on student performance. When needed, shift are made on the evidence-based strategies used to effect change.

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	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
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	32	25	38	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	14	17	42
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	8	8	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	16	11	39
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	73	73	213
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	59	50	171
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	103	108	297

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	61	64	64	189

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	4	3	3	10

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	54	38	75	167
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	26	60	102
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	3	4	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	15	38	73
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	70	63	197
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	76	89	242
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	90	71	232

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	74	82	113	269

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
					Grade Level					
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	13	26

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
					Grade Level					
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	38	75	167
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	21	19	57
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	5	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	11	2	28
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	83	77	234
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	53	55	169
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	118	111	340

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
					Grade Level					
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	70	66	202

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
					Grade Level					
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	5	7	5	17

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*	33	56	49	28	55	50	27		
ELA Learning Gains				43			32		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30			20		
Math Achievement*	44	60	56	29	43	36	22		
Math Learning Gains				47			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			19		
Science Achievement*	43	55	49	36	54	53	38		
Social Studies Achievement*	53	72	68	41	64	58	45		
Middle School Acceleration	98	74	73	77	56	49	63		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					73	70			
ELP Progress	16	50	40	50	77	76	30		

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	287
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	438
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	4	
ELL	39	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	58			
HSP	45			
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	31	Yes	3	3
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	47			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	43			

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	33			44			43	53	98			16
SWD	27			38			33	37			4	
ELL	20			38			32	30	100		6	16
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			49			41	62	96		5	
HSP	28			40			45	45	100		6	14
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	37			44			44	59	97		6	25

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	28	43	30	29	47	57	36	41	77			50
SWD	17	40	47	13	31	62	7	33				
ELL	17	33	26	23	44	51	27	19	82			50
AMI												
ASN												

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	25	40	26	25	40	48	23	50	61			
HSP	30	44	32	32	53	63	48	36	86			50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	27	42	30	28	47	59	35	40	77			49

| 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	27	32	20	22	22	19	38	45	63			30
SWD	15	21	13	14	20	17	19	18				
ELL	20	30	18	23	24	18	38	43	75			30
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	29	23	15	16	17	34	34	57			
HSP	30	33	17	30	28	20	44	55	70			25
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	27	31	19	23	23	20	39	45	63			30

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	25%	50%	-25%	47%	-22%
08	2023 - Spring	26%	51%	-25%	47%	-21%

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	24%	50%	-26%	47%	-23%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	33%	58%	-25%	54%	-21%
07	2023 - Spring	26%	48%	-22%	48%	-22%
08	2023 - Spring	37%	59%	-22%	55%	-18%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	25%	40%	-15%	44%	-19%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	56%	44%	50%	50%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	52%	13%	48%	17%

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	65%	30%	63%	32%

CIVICS

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	43%	68%	-25%	66%	-23%

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.

In reviewing available data points, proficiency scores for FAST PM3 in English Language Arts lags behind other accountability areas. By comparison, 2023 FAST PM3 proficiency in Math is 34% while FAST PM3 proficiency in ELA is 25%. A difference of 9 percentage points. As compared to the district FAST PM3 proficiency in ELA of 51%, our ELA proficiency score is 26-percentage points lower. Some of the contributing factors are as follows: new teachers in need of coaching and support, teacher and student attendance.

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

While our students have made significant progress in most accountability areas, raw student data indicates a decline in ELA proficiency scores, 27% in 2022 to 25% in 2023, a 2 percentage point decrease. Additionally, our ELA proficiency scores are 7-percentage points lower than tiered schools whose average proficiency is 32%. This can be attributed to teacher and students' attendance and a need for improved instructional strategies.

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 state of Florida averaged 47% proficiency on the FAST PM3 in English Language Arts for Middle School. Madison Middle School averaged 32% proficiency, a 15-percentage point difference. This can be attributed to teacher and students' attendance and a need for improved instructional strategies.

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

In reviewing available data points, scores for Middle School Acceleration show the most improvement as compared with the previous year's scores, 77% in 2022 to 86% in 2023, a 9-percentage point increase. Our school employed the use of Extended Learning Opportunities, IXL lessons according to students' needs, adjusted acceleration rosters according to student performance prior to testing and provided job embedded development during collaborative planning.

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

As it relates to the EWS, two areas of concern are students who scored a Level 1 on the FAST PM3 for English Language Arts and the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency.

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

Our top priorities in order of importance: improving proficiency levels for students scoring a Level 2 on 2023 FAST PM3 for English Language Arts, learning gains for L25 students in English Language Arts, improving student attendance, and maintaining and improving acceleration scores.

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 Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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 FAST PM3 in English Language Arts the state of Florida averaged 47% proficiency while Madison Middle School averaged 32%, a 15 percentage point difference. Based on this difference and an instructional staff comprised primarily of new or early career teachers, we will implement Instructional Coaching and Professional Learning.

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

With Job-Embedded Professional Development, student proficiency on FAST PM3 in English Language Arts will improve by 5 percentage points from 32% in 2023 to 37% in 2024.

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

Instructional coaches will incorporate professional learning during ELA and Reading collaborative planning and provide intensive coaching on a regular basis as evidenced by agendas and calendars. Progress and specified "look fors" will be discussed during Leadership Team Meetings. Administrators will use this information to conduct instructional walkthroughs employing the use of "glows" and "grows" for feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Karen Veras (277770@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.)

Job-Embedded Professional Development (JEPD) refers to teacher learning that is grounded in day-to-day teaching practice and is designed to enhance teachers' content-specific instructional practices with the intent of improving student learning. It is primarily school or classroom based and is integrated into the workday, consisting of teachers assessing and finding solutions for authentic and immediate problems of practice as part of a cycle of continuous improvement.

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

This intervention will facilitate acquisition of high yield teaching strategies and expand understanding of pedagogy which will improve outcomes for students. Professional Development and Coaching focused on the Framework of Effective Instruction and Student Engagement has been employed

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

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

Professional Development for Madison Middle School staff focused on the Framework of Effective Instruction and Strategies for Student Engagement. Participants will expand on their understanding of how each portion of the FEI contributes to student success.

Person Responsible: Karen Veras (277770@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 15, 2023

First collaborative planning session focused on planning for student engagement. Instructional coaches will be able to model and check teachers' understanding of the strategies that will be implemented in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Shanovia Descally (sdescally@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 18, 2023

Ongoing instructional walkthroughs looking for evidence of student engagement. Information collected from the walkthroughs will help modify next collaborative planning sessions and measure the effectiveness of the strategies being implemented.

Person Responsible: Karen Veras (277770@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 21, 2023 through October 25, 2023

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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 2021-2022 ESSA Subgroup Data Summary, SWD students have been below 32% proficient in English Language Arts for 3 consecutive years; ELL and Black students have been below 41% proficient in ELA for 1 consecutive year. Based on this data we will implement strategies targeting Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups. Contributing factors for each subgroup are the same: teacher and student attendance challenges, new teacher preparedness, and the need for development on high yield instructional strategies.

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

With a focus on Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups, SWD will improve proficiency by 3-percentage points, ELL students will improve proficiency by 4-percentage points, and Black students will improve proficiency by 5 percentage points on FAST PM3 in English Language Arts in the Spring of 2024.

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

The Assistant Principal and Instructional Coaches will meet to focus on identification and placement of students belonging to each subgroup. This information will be used to create and update an online data spreadsheet to be used by teachers to plan for instruction. Administrative walkthroughs and data chats will ensure instructional staff are providing required services.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Veras (277770@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.

The needs of the specific subgroups require provisions made for difference in achievement levels, learning styles, and adherence to accommodations.

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 3 - Promising 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.

Use 2022-2023 PM3 and 2023-2024 PM1 data to identify students belonging to each subgroup. Use the information gathered to create a spreadsheet by grade level and English Language Arts period. This spreadsheet will allow teachers to quickly identify students within each subgroup when planning for their DI needs.

Person Responsible: Karen Veras (277770@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 22, 2023

Develop student groupings and small group instruction / differentiated instruction plans during collaborative planning. Planning for DI will ensure teachers adhere to the DI schedule and framework.

Person Responsible: Shanovia Descally (sdescally@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023 - October 25, 2023

Administration will conduct walkthroughs on DI days to monitor fidelity of implementation. This will ensure support is provided and corrective measures are taken when needed.

Person Responsible: Karen Veras (277770@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 2, 2023 - October 25, 2023

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

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

According to the SIP 2023-2024 Dashboard, Attendance and EWI Report, 39% of Madison MS staff had 0-3 years experience as compared to 17% for the district, a 22 percentage point difference. Teachers are the most important factor in student achievement. Developing and retaining a high caliber instructional staff will improve student success.

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

By the summer of 2024, we will improve the percentage of staff with 4-10 of years of experience by 5 percentage points, from 32% to 37% while decreasing the percentage of teacher with 0-3 years experience by 5 percentage points, from 39% to 34%.

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

Our leadership team will incorporate the Superintendent's vision - We = One - into all faculty meetings, collaborative planning sessions, and shared school spaces/activities. We will increase opportunities for staff to provide and receive feedback and reflect on their own learning. Instructional staff will be able to define their role amongst the larger school community.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Veras (277770@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.)

Collective Efficacy can be seen as a staff's shared belief that through their collective action, they can positively influence student outcomes and achievement. In fact, research indicates that collective efficacy is the number one factor influencing student achievement.

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

While we have made great strides with academic achievement and improving school culture, our leadership team sees the benefit of building a collective and having each staff member see themselves as positively influencing student success and growing as professionals.

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.

Determine core values activity for all staff during first faculty meeting.

Person Responsible: Karen Veras (277770@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 12, 2023

During collaborative planning teachers will be provided time to reflect on a previous lesson and use data to define a challenge they are having. They will receive feedback and suggestions from their colleagues to address said challenge.

Person Responsible: Karen Veras (277770@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17, 2023 - October 25, 2023

Spotlight on teacher successes during each faculty meeting where colleagues can exchange ideas and incorporate new instructional strategies into their routines.

Person Responsible: Karen Veras (277770@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17, 2023 - October 25, 2023

#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 2023 School Climate Survey for Staff, 43% of respondents agree or strongly agree that staff morale is high at our school. This is a 35-percentage point decrease from the 2021-2022 school year. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: less respondents took the survey than in 2021-2022, teachers taking on multiple roles, teacher absences, unbalanced share of workload, we will implement Celebrating Successes as an evidence based intervention.

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

With the implementation of Celebrating Successes, an additional 10% of our staff will agree or strongly agree that staff morale is high as evidenced by the 2024 School Climate Survey administered in the Spring of 2024.

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

The School Leadership Team will continue to incorporate the Superintendent's focus - We = One - during faculty meetings, collaborative planning, and other activities/initiatives throughout the school year. Staff will have opportunities to provide feedback and suggest action plans for identified challenges.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Veras (277770@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.)

Celebrate Success is when staff and student accomplishments are given special recognition and achievements are publicly celebrated allowing for encouragement from all stakeholders. Showing the connection between effort and achievement helps students see the importance of effort and allows them to change their beliefs to emphasize it more. Recognition is more effective if it is contingent on achieving some specified standard.

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

Celebrating Successes will facilitate a shift in belief as it relates to how the school is progressing. Staff will be able to share their accomplishments, congratulate their colleagues, and develop an awareness surrounding all of the positive activities leading to a more encouraged and satisfied staff.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Sharing of data trends, accomplishments, and staff shout outs video during Opening of Schools. This action will illustrate our school's mission and vision with staff and recognize returning staff for their contributions.

Person Responsible: Karen Veras (277770@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14, 2023

Staff and student shout outs on morning announcements will make public achievements occurring throughout our school and increase stakeholder school pride.

Person Responsible: Karen Veras (277770@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17, 2023 - October 25, 2023

Mustang of the Month announced at monthly faculty meetings will improve staff morale and encourage new staff to become more engaged.

Person Responsible: Anthony Simons (simons3@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 24, 2023 - October 25, 2023

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).

Title I dollars will be used to provide Extended Learning Opportunities for students identified in the TSI subgroups.

Currently we are in need of an ESE/SWD teacher or Chair Person and paraprofessional. We have a teacher who is certified and willing to move into the open ESE/SWD position when another staff member is hired to their current position.

We were able to hire an ESOL teacher and paraprofessional this school year ensuring ELL students are able to receive and benefit from all instructional strategies.

Title I Requirements

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

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

The SIP is shared during our opening of schools meeting to gain staff feedback. Once staff members provide feedback, an EESAC meeting is scheduled where parents/guardians, community members, and

students are able to provide feedback and ask questions. A final version of the SIP is published on our school website: www.madisonms.net.

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))

As part of our Title I program our school hosts Student Orientation, Open House, Parent Workshops, and Second Cup of Coffee with our leadership team. Additionally, we engage stakeholders via our social media pages and website: madisonms.net.

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)

Students' needs will be met through Instructional Coaching, Ongoing Job-Embedded Professional Development, and Small Group/Differentiated Instruction. A school-wide intervention program will be developed to increase the amount and intensity of instruction for students in our TSI subgroups and lowest quartile.

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