Horace Mann Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Horace Mann Middle School

8950 NW 2ND AVE, El Portal, FL 33150

http://hmms.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.

Horace Mann Middle School provides a challenging, student-centered curriculum with quality instruction for all students. Learners enjoy a safe haven which fosters a productive learning environment. Students have opportunities for overall growth, improved educational outcomes, social-emotional learning assistance, and the assurance that every student is a part of their own learning process.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Horace Mann Middle School is committed to creating a safe, nurturing and disciplined learning environment for all students. High expectations are established for all learners and a foundation for life-long learning is evident. In addition to high level academic programs, all students participate in social-emotional learning while focusing on scholarly development in their journey to prepare for high school. We strive to create a learning environment that is warm, welcoming, and engaging. We envision our students as successful, loving and caring people who will become leaders in a global society. Horace Mann Middle School is a great place to grow, learn, and achieve.

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
Thompson, Ottolita	Principal	The Principal oversees the daily activities and operations within a school. Their main duties include advising students, approving Teachers' curriculums and ensuring the school environment is safe for all students and staff members.
Crystal, Brandi	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal deals with the issues of student behavior, school management, student activities and services, community relations, personnel, and curriculum instruction. The assistant principal coordinates with principal and leadership members to assist in defining and enforcing school policies and guidelines for students, staff, and faculty.
Baker-Alcide, Markicha	ELL Compliance Specialist	The ESOL teacher prepares assessment materials and designs information that cover all aspects of the English language, whether written or verbal. They keep track of student progress and customize individualized plans for students with special requirements to ensure compliance..
Murray, Shanikqua	Administrative Support	The Dean of Students serves as a member of the middle school administrative team and assists with the daily operation of the school, specifically in the areas of attendance, behavioral, and disciplinary prevention and intervention services with an emphasis on Restorative Justice and Positive Behavioral Interventions.
Davis-Nelzi, Mary	Instructional Coach	1. Support the development of high quality/effective literacy instruction by building the capacity of ELA and reading teachers. The instructional coach uses current data to assist in making curriculum decisions, focus for collaborative planning and student placement. 2. Works with curriculum support specialist and teachers to plan for instructional delivery of BEST standards based on pacing guides. 3. Work with various teams (administrators, teachers, and leaders) to facilitate analysis of data provided by progress monitoring assessments and iReady diagnostic. 4. Help teacher monitoring and tracking ongoing progress monitoring. 5. Continuously monitor, track and analyze student achievement data to identify support and tier teachers.

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 leadership team began with SIP development during summer professional development. The focus areas were based on PM3, EOC data from 2022-2023. During the opening of school the faculty had an

opportunity to review student achievement data and collaborate on the focus for the new year. The Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) along with teachers collaborate to plan, create, and implement the identified areas for

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))

SIP monitoring will be facilitated by the school leadership team. The SLT will conduct classroom walkthroughs to observe instruction and ensure students are receiving benchmark aligned instruction and support for language acquisition. The team will also meet biweekly to discuss data, student performance monitoring and progress toward school goals. The SLT will also develop intervention plans based on PM1 and PM2 data to address instructional deficiencies.

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	99%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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: 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	59	109	48	216
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	74	22	120
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	37	22	91
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	43	10	99
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	113	75	269
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	133	100	328
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	105	94	295
	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	99	150	95	344

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	17	26	7	50
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	30	10	58

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	38	140	158	336
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	33	78	133
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	24	19	61
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	83	96	250
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	103	121	307
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	81	92	246

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	49	64	77	190

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	6	19	9	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	109	48	216
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	74	22	120
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	37	22	91
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	43	10	99
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	113	75	269
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	133	100	328
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	105	94	295

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	99	150	95	344

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	17	26	7	50
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	22	7	56

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*	40	56	49	33	55	50	31		
ELA Learning Gains				43			34		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			28		
Math Achievement*	43	60	56	26	43	36	23		
Math Learning Gains				44			21		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			26		
Science Achievement*	46	55	49	37	54	53	30		
Social Studies Achievement*	57	72	68	67	64	58	45		
Middle School Acceleration	94	74	73	72	56	49	61		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					73	70			
ELP Progress	56	50	40	42	77	76	37		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	336
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	456
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
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	23	Yes	4	4
ELL	38	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	55			
HSP	60			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	56			

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%
2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
SWD	31	Yes	3	3
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	50			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	45			

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)

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
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	40			43			46	57	94			56
SWD	17			15			5	30			5	50
ELL	26			34			21	55			5	56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39			40			45	53	91		6	61
HSP	40			50			46	73	100		6	48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	42			43			48	56	93		6	56

| 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	33	43	37	26	44	55	37	67	72			42
SWD	16	37	36	16	36	48	18	40				
ELL	20	36	36	16	34	50	21	51	57			42
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	41	38	22	41	55	34	65	73			42
HSP	43	50	35	34	51	61	42	70	70			40
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	34	43	35	26	43	55	36	66	72			41

| 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	31	34	28	23	21	26	30	45	61			37
SWD	10	33	36	6	26	24	11	27				
ELL	28	38	31	19	18	34	15	32	53			37
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	32	29	21	20	24	31	45	61			34
HSP	40	38	21	27	23	33	30	46	59			40
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	31	33	27	22	20	24	32	44	62			36

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	31%	50%	-19%	47%	-16%
08	2023 - Spring	41%	51%	-10%	47%	-6%
06	2023 - Spring	30%	50%	-20%	47%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	36%	58%	-22%	54%	-18%
07	2023 - Spring	38%	48%	-10%	48%	-10%
08	2023 - Spring	38%	59%	-21%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	30%	40%	-10%	44%	-14%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	56%	37%	50%	43%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	52%	34%	48%	38%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	65%	31%	63%	33%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	68%	-13%	66%	-11%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Based on the 2022-2023 FAST/EOC PM3 assessment, the data component that had the lowest component was English Language Arts with 39% of the students tested scoring proficient.

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

Based on the 2022-2023 FAST/EOC PM3 assessment, the data component that had the greatest decline from 2022 to 2023 was Civics. The proficiency went from 67% in 2022 to 58% in 2023.

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.

Based on the 2022-2023 FAST assessment results, literacy had the largest gap when compared to the state assessment results. The state proficiency rate was 47% in 6th grade, while the school proficiency in 6th grade was 33%.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement would be the area of Mathematics. The math proficiency increased from 26% in 2022 to 47% in 2023.

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

Based on the EWS data from 2022-2023, an area of concern would be the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. Based on state assessment data, 250 students were identified as having substantial reading deficiencies.

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

1. Instructional Planning using Data
2, ELA Proficiency and Growth
3. Civics Proficiency
4. Acceleration (Biology, Algebra, Geometry)
5. Development of school culture and school programs to enhance academic growth.

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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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

According to the 2022-2023 FAST PM3 data, 33% of 6th grade students were proficient in English Language Arts (ELA) as compared to the state average of 47% and district average of 50%. In 7th grade, 33% were proficient as compared to the state average of 47% and district average of 50%. Results in 8th grade reflect 48% of students proficient compared to the state average of 47% and district average of 51%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of newly implemented standards, novice teachers to the district and certified teacher shortage within the ELA/ Reading and ESOL departments. Implementing new standards requires strategic instruction achieved by the careful scaffolding of information and tasks, we will implement and focus on Benchmark- aligned Instruction to improve teacher efficacy in instructional choices to provide instruction in the full intent of the standards.

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

With the implementation of benchmark-aligned instruction, 137 of students will demonstrate proficiency in English Language Arts on the 2023-2024 F.A.S.T. PM3. This will increase the schoolwide proficiency to 40%. In 6th grade, the proficiency will increase from 30% in 2022-2023 to 35% 2023-2024. To achieve this 30 6th grade students will be proficient. In 7th grade, the proficiency will increase from 30% in 2022-2023 to 34% 2023-2024. To achieve this 46 7th grade students will be proficient. In 8th grade, the proficiency will increase from 41% in 2022-2023 to 50% 2023-2024. To achieve this 61 8th grade students will be proficient.

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

The administrative team will monitor each collaborative planning session to ensure that teachers are planning benchmark aligned lessons. Additionally, the administrative team and the instructional coach will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor instructional delivery and alignment to the benchmarks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brandi Crystal (302778@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.)

The evidence-based intervention our school will focus on to achieve our target goal is benchmark-aligned instruction. To support this intervention we will utilize collaborative planning to deliberate common concerns, decode benchmarks and apply consensus building on best practices and high yield instructional practices.

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

Focusing on benchmark-aligned instruction will ensure that lesson are relevant and rigorous and aligned to state standards. The end product for collaborative planning will be to develop lesson plans that are state aligned and student centered.

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 instructional coach will develop a collaborative planning schedule and meeting template to facilitate the development of benchmark-aligned lesson plans for English Language Arts as well as Reading.

Person Responsible: Mary Davis-Nelzi (198045@dadeschools.net)

By When: The calendar and framework for collaborative planning will be complete by September 5, 2023.

The instructional coach will conduct an impact cycle on effective lesson planning with the literacy teachers.

Person Responsible: Mary Davis-Nelzi (198045@dadeschools.net)

By When: By October 2nd the instructional coach will have tiered the teachers based on support needed and created a calendar to conduct impact cycle.

The literacy team will use a collaborative planning session to review PM1 data and create a focus calendar of benchmarks to remediate.

Person Responsible: Brandi Crystal (302778@dadeschools.net)

By When: By October 2nd the literacy team will have completed their data disaggregation from PM1 and created intervention groups based on data and an intervention calendar.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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 data performance on PM3 in 2022-2023, students that are identified as SWD and ELL are consistently performing below the federal index of 41%. SWD students have performed below the federal index of 32% three consecutive years achieving 31% in 2022-2023. ELL students fell below the 41% federal index achieving 36% during 2022-2023. SWD students will achieve 35% proficiency

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

With the implementation of differentiated instruction, students will have the opportunity to meet individual learning targets and achieve learning gains in literacy and math. If we successfully implement differentiated instruction 65% of the SWD and ELL math students and 55% of the ELL and SWD literacy students will achieve learning gains on the 2023-2024 FAST assessment. The number of ELL students meeting the federal index will increase to 41% in 2023-2024 from 36% proficiency achieved in 2022-2023. The number of students in SWD meeting the federal index will increase to 32% in 2023-2024 from 31% in 2022-2023.

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

The SLT will conduct classroom walkthroughs to observe small group instruction. The focus of the walkthrough will be to observe the instructional delivery of differentiated instruction based on collaborative planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brandi Crystal (302778@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.)

To increase proficiency among SWD and ELL students, teachers will provide students with opportunities to practice making sense of stretch text that will expose them to complex ideas and information. The text will be no more than one grade level below for SWD students to provide rigor. The text will be given in small groups providing the teacher an opportunity to differentiate instructional practices for students that may need additional support.

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

Providing students in these targeted subgroups exposure to these higher-level vocabulary , sentences, and ideas can assist students in language acquisition and reading comprehension, develop confidence, deeper knowledge, and exposure to test-like passages.

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.

Administration will attend collaborative planning where data will be reviewed and student groups will be created for remediation and small group intervention.

Person Responsible: Brandi Crystal (302778@dadeschools.net)

By When: Beginning the week of August 21st, administration will attend weekly collaborative planning sessions to monitor lesson plan development for differentiated instruction.

SLT will provide each teacher with student data including PM3 data from 2022-2023 and PM1 data from 2023-2024. Data will be compiled based on subgroups to identify students in need of intervention of specific benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Brandi Crystal (302778@dadeschools.net)

By When: Data will be compiled and distributed to teachers by September 26 following the PM1 administration.

Instructional coaches will model small group instruction and differentiation based on student data for teachers.

Person Responsible: Mary Davis-Nelzi (198045@dadeschools.net)

By When: By October 2nd, the instructional coach will have a calendar developed to model for each teacher small group instruction.

#3. 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 the school's current demographic information, there are 109 ELL learners which account for 28.5% of the school's total population. There are 60 students identified as SWD in 2023-2024 which accounts for 15.7% of the students population. The proficiency in ELA among ELL was 28% in 2022-2023 which was 6% lower than the school proficiency of 34% in 2022-2023. In the area of social studies 30% of SWD students were proficient in 2022-2023 where the school had a proficiency of 55% in 2022-2023. In the area of Mathematics, 14% of SWD students were proficient n the FAST assessment, where the school mathematics proficiency was 39% in 2022-2023. Teachers should be intentional in their planning sessions creating lessons and activities that utilize appropriate ESOL strategies and provide accommodations for English language learners as well as SWD students.

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

With the implementation of effective collaborative planning sessions for ELL learners and SWD students, there will be a 2% increase in ELA and Mathematics proficiency among ELA learners increasing proficiency from 28% in 2022-2023 to 30% in ELA and from 37% in 2022-2023 to 39% in Mathematics on the 2023-2024 FAST assessment. Among SWD there will be 10% increase in ELA and Mathematics proficiency increasing Math proficiency to 24% and ELA proficiency to 26% In the area of Science there will be 15% increase in proficiency among SWD.

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

Administration will participate in common planning sessions led by the instructional coach. The instructional coach will provide ongoing support to teachers on appropriate ESOL strategies. Administration will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor to fidelity to instructional plans and ESOL strategies that were planned for. School leadership team will meet to discuss progress of implementation and next steps. Teachers will be able to engage ELL learners in meaningful learning activities that will improve language acquisition and improve student achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brandi Crystal (302778@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.)

To improve language acquisition teachers will provide small-group instructional intervention to students struggling in areas of literacy and English Language development. This will include pairing students with bilingual students in non-literacy classes.

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

Providing interventions on a daily basis, that are teacher-directed, and scaffolded using the appropriate resources will make learning easier and students will have additional opportunities to practice what is being learned.

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 instructional coach will lead collaborative planning for reading teachers and ELA teachers based on the ETO instructional framework. The planning components will be centered around providing ESOL strategies for students acquiring the language, planning for small group instruction and unpacking the benchmark.

Person Responsible: Mary Davis-Nelzi (198045@dadeschools.net)

By When: This process is ongoing based on the collaborative planning schedule.

The transformational coach will utilize the impact cycle to model ESOL strategies in the developmental and ESOL through ELA classes to build the capacity of each teacher.

Person Responsible: Mary Davis-Nelzi (198045@dadeschools.net)

By When: The impact cycles will commence in October following the September collaboratory.

To increase language acquisition and comprehension for ELL learners, bilingual students will be paired with ELL students to collaborate in the social science, science and mathematics classroom.

Person Responsible: Brandi Crystal (302778@dadeschools.net)

By When: The grouping of bilingual students with ESOL students will take place following the PM1 assessment.

The ESE department chair will provide teachers with a copy of student IEP's that list accommodations needed to support learning in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Brandi Crystal (302778@dadeschools.net)

By When: IEP's will be provided to teachers by September 19th. A training will be provided to staff during the faculty meeting on how to provide accommodations list on the IEP.

#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.

Based on the 2022-2023 school climate data, students did not feel as though the school exhibited the best school culture. There was a 10.87% increase in the number of students that disagreed with the statement " I like coming to school" from 47 % 2021-2022 to 57% in 2022-2023. By focusing on improving the overall school culture, there will be an increase in student attendance, school pride, and student achievement.

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

If we successfully improve the school culture and learning environment, the number of students agreeing with the statement "I like coming to school" will increase from 25% in 2022-2023 to 40% in 2023-2024.

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

The area of focus will be monitored through improved attendance and participation in extended learning opportunities, activities and clubs offered by the school. Agendas and sign-in sheets will be collected to monitor attendance and participation in extracurricular programs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brandi Crystal (302778@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.)

Clubs and Extracurricular Programming offerings align with students' interests help increase students' perception of the school community. Offering Electives/Academies during the school day that are aligned with students' interests can help increase students' valuing of school and also increase student engagement. There are also numerous studies that show how exposure to engaging activities, athletics and music can positively impact students' overall achievement and attendance.

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

Exposure to extracurricular activities and athletic activities outside of academics helps students build positive relationships with peers and staff. It increases student engagement which leads to improved attendance and positively impacts students perceptions of the school community.

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.

Students will be given an opportunity to select from school clubs, activities and sports to improve their middle school experience and enhance the school culture.

Person Responsible: Shanikqua Murray (smurray_07@dadeschools.net)

By When: Club rush will take place on Friday, September 22nd during lunch.

The school will begin preparing for STEAM designation by offering STEAM activities in core and elective classes and providing students an opportunity to compete in science fair, SECME and music competitions through the district.

Person Responsible: Davrye Gibson-Smith (264855@dadeschools.net)

By When: By September 29th, each STEAM teacher will incorporate into their lesson STEAM activities according to the STEAM lesson plan and rubric.

Teachers will be surveyed on extracurricular activities and clubs they would like to sponsor or create to service students based on student interest.

Person Responsible: Shanikqua Murray (smurray_07@dadeschools.net)

By When: By September 19th a survey of activities, athletics and clubs will be sent to sponsor a club or activity through community education that is not currently offered.

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).

School improvement funding will be allocated based on the needs identified by the EESAC committee, PTSA and other stakeholders including the school leadership team. Student services will assist in identifying students that are in critical need of resources to help them improve academically, socially and emotionally. The school leadership team will meet bi-weekly to discuss progress toward the school improvement plan, and review data of underperforming students. The funding will support providing extended learning throughout the school year for students that need additional support to perform on grade level.

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.

In addition to providing access to the SIP via the school webpage, the SIP will be covered during each EESAC meeting, faculty meeting, Parent Academy and community partners meeting. The third Tuesday of each month the faculty meets followed EESAC.
https://api.dadeschools.net/schoolwebsite/#!/?schoolId=6411

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))

In an effort to build positive relationships with parents and families, the school will utilize various communication methods and social media to keep families informed and promote the school. Class Dojo will be utilized by each teacher to create an additional means of communication with families. The family engagement plan will be shared during the parent academy meetings which is held the last Thursday of each month.
https://api.dadeschools.net/schoolwebsite/#!/?schoolId=6411

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)

To strengthen the academic programs, the school will focus on increasing teacher capacity in understanding new state standards and benchmarks. This will be facilitated through collaborative planning and professional developments offered by the Educational Transformation Office.

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))

Title 1 school allocation funds will be utilized to support extended learning opportunities through before and after-school tutoring as well as provide resources and support for students identified for project upstart. The Title 1 funds support a community involvement specialist that provides outreach to parents and families needing additional resources to help students improve their academic performance.