

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Southwood Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>12</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>17</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>26</b> |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>0</b>  |

# Southwood Middle School

16301 SW 80TH AVE, Palmetto Bay, FL 33157

<http://southwood.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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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.**

Southwood Middle School is committed to preparing our students to become productive, responsible, and self-reliant citizens ready to meet the challenges of tomorrow's technological and multi-cultural society.

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

Southwood Middle School strives to forge a partnership with society in order to build a community of learners who are well prepared to meet 21st century challenges. In order to do so, the school offers its diverse population an intellectually stimulating curriculum in a culturally rich and accepting environment. Ultimately, students will develop a sense of respect for the individual rights of others while developing their own sense of self.

### 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  |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| Garcia, Raul    | Principal           | The principal is responsible for providing strategic direction for the school. The principal oversees the implementation of the school's curriculum, monitors student achievement, encourages parental involvement, reviews and revises policies and procedures, manages the school's budget and is responsible for the hiring and evaluation of all school staff. The principal is the lead in security and safety and is the coordinator of all school events and programs.  |
| Alvarez, Daniel | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal, under the direction of the school principal, serves as the leader in school curriculum, security, and the planning and coordinating of school events and programs. The assistant principal works with the SPED and ELL department to ensure all students receive appropriate accommodations to ensure academic success. The Assistant Principal assist in the implementation of the Principal's vision to use data-based decision making; ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS; conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; and ensures adequate professional development to support teachers. |
| Abanto, Vanessa | Other               | The activities and athletics director position is responsible to coordinate and implement all extra curricular activities related to sports, school performances, field trips and serves as the school's community liaison.  |
| Cruz, Suzette   | Teacher, K-12       | The English Language Arts Department Chair provides instructional leadership and enhances articulation regarding curriculum alignment with standards. She facilitates the development and use of common assessments in order to determine instructional strategies that will most effectively meet the needs of students.  |
| Capo, Joyia     | Teacher, K-12       | The Mathematics Department Chair provides instructional leadership and enhances articulation regarding curriculum alignment with standards. She facilitates the development and use of common assessments in order to determine instructional strategies that will most effectively meet the needs of students.  |
| Dunbar, Rachel  | Teacher, K-12       | The Science Department Chair provides instructional leadership and enhances articulation regarding curriculum alignment with standards. She facilitates the development and use of common assessments in order to determine instructional strategies that will most effectively meet the needs of students.  |

| Name            | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| Jacquette, Gail | Magnet Coordinator  | The magnet coordinator is responsible for the recruitment of students, public relations, managing student programs and activities, management of budget and the monitoring of program success.   |
| Jaile, Kristen  | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal, under the direction of the school principal, serves as the leader in school curriculum, security, and the planning and coordinating of school events and programs. The assistant principal works with the SPED and ELL department to ensure all students receive appropriate accommodations to ensure academic success. The Assistant Principal assist in the implementation of the Principal’s vision to use data-based decision making; ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS; conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; and ensures adequate professional development to support 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.

At Southwood Middle School, stakeholders play a crucial role in our School Improvement Plan (SIP) development. We have a School Leadership Team (SLT) that oversees the process and facilitates communication. Teachers and staff contribute through weekly department meetings, while parents, students, and families provide input through surveys and conferences. External stakeholders, including business and community leaders, are engaged through aligning our programs with local needs. We fulfill ESSA requirements with a monthly School Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting. The input gathered from all stakeholders shapes our SIP, reflecting our collective vision for continuous improvement.

**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))

Southwood Middle School will establish a comprehensive monitoring framework with key components including data collection, regular data analysis, continued progress monitoring and engaging stakeholders in feedback and reflection. Through data collection we will review assessments, student performance, attendance, and discipline records to identify trends and areas for improvement, especially for students with the greatest achievement gap. We will then analyze the collected data to identify patterns, strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement, informing SIP revisions. Also, through



progress monitoring of established benchmarks and milestones to assess progress toward SIP goals and taking prompt action to address deviations or challenges. Lastly, engaging stakeholders through surveys, focus groups, and meetings to gather insights into the plan's effectiveness and make necessary revisions.

To measure the SIP's impact, the school will use quantitative and qualitative measures such as analyzing student performance against state academic standards, including standardized test scores and subject-specific assessments. Focusing on students with the greatest achievement gap, comparing their performance over time to evaluate the effectiveness of targeted interventions. Conducting regular observations by administrators and instructional coaches to assess instructional practices and student engagement. Gathering stakeholder feedback such as perceptions from teachers, parents, and students through surveys, focus groups, and meetings.

Based on monitoring and evaluation results, the school will revise the SIP by reviewing monitoring data, impact assessment results, and stakeholder feedback to identify areas for improvement within the SIP. The school will collaborate with stakeholders to develop targeted strategies addressing areas of improvement, including instructional practices, professional development, and student support services. The SIP will be aligned in goals, objectives, and actions with identified strategies and updated student needs then communicating the revised SIP to stakeholders and taking necessary steps to effectively implement the updated plan, establishing clear timelines and responsibilities. Lastly, the revised plan will be continuously monitored and evaluated using the established framework, informing subsequent revisions for continuous improvement.

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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | No  |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 84%   |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 66%   |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No  |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | No  |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | ATSI  |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>English Language Learners (ELL)<br>Asian Students (ASN)<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  | 2021-22: A  |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
|  | 2019-20: A |
|  | 2018-19: A |
|  | 2017-18: A |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b> |            |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b> |            |

**Early Warning Systems**

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |     | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-----|-------|
|   | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8   |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 29 | 35  | 99    |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6  | 7  | 12  | 25    |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5  | 10  | 28    |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 6  | 9   | 27    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 45 | 59  | 151   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 29 | 54  | 137   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 85 | 118 | 266   |

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 | 44 | 31 | 54 | 129   |

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 | 1 | 0 | 1     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6     |

**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 | 21 | 66 | 85 | 172   |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4  | 42 | 84 | 130   |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 35    |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 30 | 24 | 76    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 48 | 67 | 151   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 83 | 76 | 204   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 76 | 98 | 218   |
|   | 0           | 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 | 43 | 80 | 120 | 243   |

**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 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 10    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 10    |

**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 | 21 | 66 | 85 | 172   |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4  | 42 | 84 | 130   |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 35    |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 30 | 24 | 76    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 48 | 67 | 151   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 83 | 76 | 204   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 76 | 98 | 218   |
|   | 0           | 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 | 43 | 80 | 120 | 243   |

**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 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 10    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 10    |

**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*                | 71     | 56       | 49    | 73     | 55       | 50    | 67     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              |        |          |       | 68     |          |       | 52     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      |        |          |       | 58     |          |       | 31     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 72     | 60       | 56    | 68     | 43       | 36    | 58     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             |        |          |       | 73     |          |       | 35     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     |        |          |       | 60     |          |       | 25     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 66     | 55       | 49    | 65     | 54       | 53    | 59     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     | 85     | 72       | 68    | 84     | 64       | 58    | 72     |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      | 85     | 74       | 73    | 88     | 56       | 49    | 66     |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        |          |       |        | 51       | 49    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        |          |       |        | 73       | 70    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    | 26     | 50       | 40    | 39     | 77       | 76    | 67     |          |       |

*\* 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           | 68   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 405  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 6    |
| Percent Tested                                 | 98   |
| Graduation Rate                                |      |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |      |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 68   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 676  |
| 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                                | 40                              | Yes                | 4   |   |
| ELL                                | 53                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                | 84                              |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 52                              |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 69                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                | 93                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |

| 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% |
| WHT                                | 90                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                | 55                              |                    |   |   |

| 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                                | 40                              | Yes                | 3   |   |
| ELL                                | 57                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                | 86                              |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 53                              |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 70                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                | 95                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 83                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                | 61                              |                    |   |   |

**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                                   | 71       |        |             | 72        |         |              | 66       | 85      | 85        |                   |                     | 26           |
| SWD  | 28       |        |             | 26        |         |              | 27       | 52      | 67        |                   | 5                   |              |
| ELL  | 49       |        |             | 56        |         |              | 40       | 65      | 82        |                   | 6                   | 26           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 82       |        |             | 86        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| BLK  | 46       |        |             | 46        |         |              | 37       | 60      | 73        |                   | 5                   |              |
| HSP  | 73       |        |             | 74        |         |              | 69       | 86      | 84        |                   | 6                   | 29           |

| 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 |
| MUL  | 93       |        |             | 93        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 85       |        |             | 89        |         |              | 86       | 99      | 90        |                   | 5                   |              |
| FRL  | 59       |        |             | 57        |         |              | 50       | 70      | 78        |                   | 6                   | 13           |

| 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                                   | 73       | 68     | 58          | 68        | 73      | 60           | 65       | 84      | 88        |                   |                     | 39           |
| SWD  | 32       | 51     | 48          | 22        | 53      | 45           | 13       | 53      |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 54       | 54     | 50          | 56        | 75      | 76           | 27       | 71      | 64        |                   |                     | 39           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 83       | 81     |             | 87        | 81      |              | 83       |         | 100       |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 42       | 59     | 49          | 38        | 59      | 46           | 41       | 61      | 81        |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 76       | 68     | 65          | 71        | 76      | 69           | 65       | 88      | 85        |                   |                     | 39           |
| MUL  | 100      |        |             | 90        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 92       | 74     | 62          | 87        | 80      | 68           | 90       | 100     | 96        |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 62       | 65     | 58          | 55        | 68      | 55           | 52       | 77      | 77        |                   |                     | 36           |

| 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                                   | 67       | 52     | 31          | 58        | 35      | 25           | 59       | 72      | 66        |                   |                     | 67           |
| SWD  | 26       | 38     | 31          | 18        | 24      | 20           | 19       | 19      | 29        |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 59       | 54     | 37          | 52        | 35      | 28           | 41       | 59      | 75        |                   |                     | 67           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 88       | 68     |             | 88        | 63      |              |          | 100     |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 42       | 35     | 22          | 31        | 23      | 15           | 27       | 47      | 39        |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 70       | 55     | 33          | 61        | 35      | 29           | 62       | 72      | 69        |                   |                     | 67           |
| MUL  | 82       | 55     |             | 75        | 50      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 81       | 62     | 50          | 75        | 46      | 43           | 77       | 92      | 73        |                   |                     |              |

| 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 |
| FRL  | 56       | 46     | 26          | 46        | 30      | 24           | 48       | 58      | 56        |                   |                     | 64           |

**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 | 68%    | 50%      | 18%                        | 47%   | 21%                     |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 66%    | 51%      | 15%                        | 47%   | 19%                     |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 69%    | 50%      | 19%                        | 47%   | 22%                     |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 77%    | 58%      | 19%                        | 54%   | 23%                     |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 30%    | 48%      | -18%                       | 48%   | -18%                    |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 69%    | 59%      | 10%                        | 55%   | 14%                     |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08      | 2023 - Spring | 62%    | 40%      | 22%                        | 44%   | 18%                     |

| ALGEBRA |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A     | 2023 - Spring | 91%    | 56%      | 35%                        | 50%   | 41%                     |



| GEOMETRY |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade    | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A      | 2023 - Spring | *      | 52%      | *                          | 48%   | *                       |

| BIOLOGY |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A     | 2023 - Spring | 100%   | 65%      | 35%                        | 63%   | 37%                     |

| CIVICS |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade  | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A    | 2023 - Spring | 80%    | 68%      | 12%                        | 66%   | 14%                     |

### 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.**

Our English Language Arts proficiency percentage dropped 1% point from the previous school year. Furthermore, in the subgroup of SWD the data analysis shows this subgroup with the least amount of proficient students (25%) in 22-23. We believe that the following factors contributed to this: 1. Our English Language Arts team had multiple rookie teachers, 2. Teachers are still hesitant to incorporate differentiated instruction into lessons and 3. A teacher was on medical leave for a large majority of the year.

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

Using the findings from the 2023 Civics EOC data, the data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year is our Civics proficiency percentage which dropped 4% points. The factors that contributed were lack of fidelity to differentiated instruction and within the department there were educators with less than 3 years teaching experience.

**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.**

All of assessed subject areas out performed the State (English Language Arts 21% percentage points above state average, Math 9% percentage points above the state average, Science 15% percentage points above the state average, and Social Studies 12% points above the state average).

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

Mathematics showed an improvement from 54% proficiency in 21-22 to 62% proficiency in 22-23. The actions taken to increase Math performance included the continuous progress monitoring programs implemented with fidelity such as iReady, student centered data chats took place after each assessment and differentiated instruction was incorporated in daily instruction.

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

Majority of our students in the SWD subgroup have substantial reading deficiencies. Meeting the needs of these learners and closing the gap is our top priority this year.

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

The highest priority for school improvement for the upcoming school year will be to support our teachers with the implementation of differentiated instruction in all subject areas. Secondly, we will need support and monitor closely our lowest performing students. We also will be putting action steps in place to implement the Targeted Element of Positive Behavior Support (PBS).

**Area of Focus**

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

**#1. 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.

Using the findings from the 22-23 FAST assessment, students in the ESE subgroup in both English Language Arts (25% proficiency) and Math (29%) demonstrated the greatest need for improvement.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

With strategic placement of teachers and the implementation of differentiated instruction based on progress monitoring data across both subject areas, we expect 4% increase in proficiency in both English Language Arts and Math for that subgroup.

**Monitoring:**

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

Administrators will conduct daily walkthroughs to ensure fidelity to the pacing guide during whole group instruction, quality remediation during differentiated instruction. Following walkthroughs, administrators will provide ongoing and timely feedback. Administrators will also monitor student data as well as conduct data chats with teachers to ensure that teachers are using the data to remediate benchmarks effectively.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Raul Garcia (pr6861@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 an evidence based strategy that can effectively address continuously low performance in English Language Arts and Math as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST), by implementing Differentiated Instruction across both subject area classes, the school will bridge the achievement gap and improve overall success.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiated Instruction recognizes that students have diverse learning interests, needs and abilities. This approach specializes instruction to meet the need of individual learners while ensuring that they receive targeted support and tasks at the appropriate level. Our plan is to use the iReady computer program along with the iReady teacher tool box which is a district adopted program specifically designed to target student learning deficiencies for differentiated instruction. Using this evidence based approach, students skills' will be fostered and overall success towards closing the achievement gap will be accomplished.

**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.

Teachers will participate in collaborative planning once a week so that they can discuss content covered, student work samples, pacing and shared best practices. Evidence of cross-curricular planning, the use of data, samples of rigorous student centered activities, best practices and lesson plans that support the Florida BEST Standards.

**Person Responsible:** Joyia Capo (jscapo@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23-10/13/23

Weekly administrative walk-throughs to ensure student engagement is taking place while use of standard-based instruction is on pace, differentiated instruction is being conducted and data driven lessons are on target. Teachers will also incorporate hands on activities and the use of higher order thinking questions.

**Person Responsible:** Kristen Jaile (kristenh@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23-10/13/23

Weekly monitoring programs for students with disabilities/at-risk students to help improve their achievement. Counselors will provide students with individual and group counseling. Student orientations, weekly progress reports, and parent teacher conferences will also be facilitated to properly implement the desired outcome.

**Person Responsible:** Golnaz Sami (gsami@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23-10/13/23

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

### 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.

Sustaining and increasing proficiency is an area that needs to be maintained. In order to maintain and increase proficiency levels, student engagement and on-task student authentic learning opportunities must be a priority in the classroom. According to the 2023 FAST data, ELA decreased by 1 proficiency percentage point, Science showed 0 proficiency percentage point growth and Civics decreased by 4 proficiency percentage points in comparison to last years data.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Southwood Middle will increase student performance by 5% in all assessed subject areas as measured by the progress monitoring data by June 7, 2023. We will monitor progress for ELA and Math through FAST Assessment data (PM 1,2 and 3), in Civics though the district provided Baseline Assessment along with district provided Mid-Year Assessment, and for 8th-grade Science the district provided Baseline Assessment along with the district provided Mid-Year Assessment.

### Monitoring:

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

Administrators will conduct daily walkthroughs to ensure student engagement during whole group instruction, as well as during differentiated instruction. Following walkthroughs, administrators will provide ongoing and timely feedback. Administrators will also monitor student data as well as conduct data chats with teachers following iReady and Progress Monitoring Assessments to improve teacher instruction and student engagement in the classroom.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Raul Garcia (pr6861@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 strategy we will be implementing is student engagement. The use of scaffolded lessons and the gradual release of instruction method of learning will be implemented during whole group instruction. Students will engage in the gradual release model for instruction that will provide students with opportunities to produce authentic work using higher order thinking skills.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The implementation of the evidence based strategy Student Engagement will provide lessons based on the standards and learning targets. Teachers will explicitly deliver planned lessons through gradual release model to students and ensure that all student products and teaching techniques are aligned to the intended standards. Students will show evidence of mastering the objectives through classwork samples and assessment data, which will assist in accelerating all students to their full academic potential.

### 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.

Teachers will be provided with monthly professional development related to effective implementation of the gradual release model of instruction resulting in teachers being able to provide engaging focused instruction to meet students' needs.

**Person Responsible:** Kristen Jaile (kristenh@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23-10/13/2023

Weekly collaborative planning will be conducted to provide teachers with an opportunity to share challenges, identify misconceptions, and share best practices to address misconceptions and promote student engagement. If teachers use this collaborative planning as a tool to brainstorm and address misconceptions, then this will help promote student engagement during lessons.

**Person Responsible:** Suzette Cruz (scrzlopez@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23-10/13/23

Analyze periodic assessments at the end of units/topics, which effectively target each benchmark and gauge understanding. As a result of the analysis of the topic or mini assessment data, it will be placed on an easy to use platform for teachers to monitor daily.

**Person Responsible:** Kristen Jaile (kristenh@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23-10/13/23

Weekly administrative walk-throughs to ensure student engagement is taking place while use of standard-based instruction is on pace, differentiated instruction is being conducted and data driven lessons are on target. Teachers will also incorporate hands on activities and the use of higher order thinking questions.

**Person Responsible:** Raul Garcia (pr6861@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23-10/13/23

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

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Based on the data review from the District/Tiered Disciplinary Comparison, as a school 9% of students receiving referrals as compared to other Tier 1 schools with only 6%, that is a 3% difference. Our school will implement the Targeted Element of Positive Behavior Support (PBS). Through our data review, we noticed that students who struggle with disciplinary issues are also students not meeting expectations for learning gains as well as proficiency. In addition, many of our Lowest 25% students have had reoccurring disciplinary issues. We recognize the need to tailor our discipline initiatives and improve making connections with families and the community to ensure student success.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement the Targeted Element of Positive Behavior Support, our students will receive quality instruction that will contribute to improved student outcomes. With consistent student incentives, our disciplinary issues will decrease by 3 percentage points by June 2023.

#### Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team will work to connect with families who struggle with their student's behavior at school and identify the root cause for unwarranted behavior and create a plan of action to ensure students are able to behave in school daily. The Leadership Team will mentor individual students who have consistent disciplinary issues and connect with them daily to reward or encourage their efforts. The Leadership Team will plan for student incentives to promote consistent student positive behavior. Teachers will monitor behavior and submit data to the Leadership Team on a weekly basis with emphasis on behavior trends. To ensure we are on track to meeting the outcome above, this data will be discussed during data chats with teachers and students. Parental contact will also be necessary.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Alvarez (daalvarez@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.)

Within the targeted element of Positive Behavior Support, our school will focus on the evidence based strategy of : Discipline Initiatives. Discipline Initiatives will assist in narrowing the discipline gap amongst our students. Student discipline will be monitored on a weekly basis to prevent a pattern of excessive disciplinary issues.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Positive Behavior Support Initiatives will assist in decreasing the number of student disciplinary incidences. The initiatives will provide the Leadership Team with a systematic approach to identify discipline issues, remediation and rewards.

#### 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.

Use a Positive Behavior Support (PBS) system in order to promote prosocial behavior throughout the school on a daily basis. Those students showing positive behavior such as doing the right thing, helping others, preventing altercations will be monitored and recognized on social media, school website, displayed on TV's, and announced over our school PA system. We expect a reduction of disciplinary cases by highlighting the positive interactions students have with each other.

**Person Responsible:** Golnaz Sami (gsami@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23-10/13/23

Our Student Services Department will provide a weekly mentoring program for identified students needing conflict resolution strategies to promote a positive school environment. As a result of the Student Services mentoring program, the identified students will receive in depth conflict resolution strategies that will in turn help the student handle difficult or challenging situations to ensure a positive learning environment.

**Person Responsible:** Golnaz Sami (gsami@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23-10/13/23

A student weekly incentive program will be established, such as Superstar Student of the Week campaign which will recognize one student for their outstanding performance in the classroom. Utilize motivational incentives for random acts of kindness and reward students doing the right thing and help increase student achievement and participation in class since the teacher will be nominating them.

**Person Responsible:** Daniel Alvarez (daalvarez@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23-10/13/23



#### #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 question "School personnel work together as a team" from the School Climate survey comparing from (78%) 2021-22 and (72%) 2022-23. There was a noticeable decrease of 6%, which we want to use the Targeted Element of the Instructional Leadership Team to address the decrease. Teachers in the building don't feel that they have a voice in the decision-making process, therefore we want to develop teacher leaders by involving them in school-wide initiatives and ensuring they are informed and feel as though they have membership to the school community. By involving them in school-wide initiatives and allowing them the opportunity to further their learning, student success is positively impacted.

##### Measurable Outcome:

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

If our teachers are provided the opportunity to contribute to school-wide decisions through monthly meetings. This will be realized through teachers participating in the logistical elements of meetings, presenting ideas to solve issues that arise, etc. The percentage of teachers in leadership roles will increase by at least 5% by June 2024.

##### Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team will identify specific staff members that are experts in areas that will serve as leads with new initiatives and development. By involving teachers, we hope to create an environment of shared leadership. This initiative will be evident by teacher leaders providing support and development to their colleagues in various areas. To ensure we are on the right track, teachers who receive support will share the knowledge they have gained during faculty meetings.

##### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristen Jaile (kristenh@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.)

We will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Involving Staff in Important Decisions. By creating a teacher leaders list and involving teachers in the decision making process, we hope to increase the feeling of shared leadership. Teacher leaders in the building will provide a summary of support to the Leadership Team on a monthly basis to ensure we are on the right track to meeting the outcome above.

##### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Developing and including the staff to share leadership will assist in integrating the talents of teachers within the building to carry out the vision, the mission, and problem solve any issues that exist. Throughout this process the Leadership Team will create buy in and bring creative and innovative solutions to the forefront.

##### 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.

A School Safety Committee will meet monthly to provide an opportunity for faculty and staff to feel empowered and also create and implement school wide initiatives to keep our students and staff safe. The successful implementation of this step will provide the faculty with opportunities to create a schoolwide safety action plan that will allow committee members to voice their ideas and concerns. This will be evidenced by meeting attendance rosters, meeting agendas, committee action plan and execution of a safe learning environment.

**Person Responsible:** Gail Jacquette (gjacquette@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23-10/13/2023

A School Attendance Committee will meet monthly and provide an opportunity for faculty and staff to feel empowered and also create and implement school wide attendance initiatives. The successful implementation of this step will provide the faculty with opportunities to create a school attendance action plan that will allow committee members to voice their ideas and concerns. This will be evidenced by meeting attendance rosters, meeting agendas, committee action plan and a reduction in student referrals and absences from school.

**Person Responsible:** Golnaz Sami (gsami@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23-10/13/23

Schoolwide teacher-to-student mentoring program. All teachers, counselors, administrators will mentor two L25 or low performing students and be a guiding light for them and assist with making sure the student is successful in school. Each week the mentor teacher will meet with the student to provide feedback and helpful strategies and set goals to be successful in class. Each nine-weeks when grades are released those students that showed improvement will be rewarded with different types of incentives.

**Person Responsible:** Daniel Alvarez (daalvarez@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17/23-10/13/23

**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).

In accordance with Florida Continuous Improvement Model, student data and initiatives are frequently monitored to identify areas of strength and areas of need. In order to increase the amount of time students are allocated for differentiated instruction and to reduce class size in special education classes teachers are offered 6th period supplements. Additionally, funds are allocated to provide special education students with before and after school interventions based on their Individualized Education Plan goals. Through these programs students receive targeted instruction in Reading and Math.