South Miami Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

South Miami Middle School

6750 SW 60TH ST, South Miami, FL 33143

http://smmcs.dadeschools.net/

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

South Miami Middle Community School provides opportunities for every student to become a responsible thinking citizen through an extended family of teachers, parents, students, community and business leaders working and learning together in a safe, caring environment to develop knowledge of careers, technology, the arts, and social skills as they relate to the world of work and individual future planning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In the pursuit of excellence and the belief that every child can learn, South Miami Middle Community School strives to guide students to be lifelong learners who are ever reaching beyond the mark of excellence. Our school operates on the fundamental principles of truth, honesty, integrity, and community.

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
Izaguirre, Fabiola	Principal	Provides a common school vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing SIP, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation of identified areas of need, ensures adequate professional development to support student learning, and communicates with parents regarding school-based plans and activities. Reviews student and teacher data and progress for all students, including target groups and individual students.
Perez-Sanz, Ingrid	Assistant Principal	Ensure commitment to the SIP process and identifies resources for teachers and students. Additionally, assistant principals monitor the levels of support from core to intensive practices and interventions, as well as, make recommendations for professional development to support the SIP implementation. Review student data and progress for all students, including target groups and individual students.
Grinan, Alison	Teacher, K-12	Share common goal of improving instruction for all students and will work together to build staff support, internal capacity and sustainability over time. Provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, collaborates with other staff to implement identified interventions and strategies.
Miller, Catherine	Teacher, K-12	Share common goal of improving instruction for all students and will work together to build staff support, internal capacity and sustainability over time. Provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, collaborates with other staff to implement identified interventions and strategies.
Marin, Lynda	Teacher, K-12	Share common goal of improving instruction for all students and will work together to build staff support, internal capacity and sustainability over time. Provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, collaborates with other staff to implement identified interventions and strategies.
Eckert, Mimi	Teacher, K-12	Share common goal of improving instruction for all students and will work together to build staff support, internal capacity and sustainability over time. Provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, collaborates with other staff to implement identified interventions and strategies.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Conway, Genesis	Teacher, K-12	Share common goal of improving instruction for all students and will work together to build staff support, internal capacity and sustainability over time. Provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, collaborates with other staff to implement identified interventions and strategies.

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.

School leadership team reviews assessment data and develops areas of focus and action steps to be implemented during the school year based on accountability indicators. The leadership's recommendations are shared with all stakeholders - teachers, parents, students, and community members through faculty, department, PTSA and EESAC meetings. Stakeholder input and feedback is encouraged in revising and adjusting school improvement plan implementation and interventions.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The school improvement plan is continously monitored for effective implementation of action steps and areas of focus. Through collaborative planning and department meetings faculty feedback and input is shared in order to make instructional adjustments as needed. In addition, throughout the year after each progress monitoring window for ELA, Math, Science, Civics and EOCs, an analysis of the data is shared with all stakeholders in faculty, EESAC and PTSA meetings. Based on the data results the leadership team reviews accountability standards and provides follow-up professional learning opportunities for teachers in order to target instructional delivery of area(s) of need. Further, leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs in order to monitor classroom instructional delivery focused on action steps to improve student achievement.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	90%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	69%

Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	20	17	28	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	23
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	7	3	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	41	50	130
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	24	30	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	71	81	210

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	34	25	37	96

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

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	7	11	27	45
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	28	20	56
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	2	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	4	19
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	31	39	94
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	6	41	88
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	63	69	170

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	18	14	37	69

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	1	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	4

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	16	28	35	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	17	10	36
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	9	19
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	53	64	159
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	29	46	98
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	87	106	267

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	24	38	41	103

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	66	56	49	70	55	50	67		
ELA Learning Gains				63			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			36		
Math Achievement*	69	60	56	66	43	36	60		
Math Learning Gains				72			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			29		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	63	55	49	63	54	53	50		
Social Studies Achievement*	67	72	68	79	64	58	80		
Middle School Acceleration	79	74	73	82	56	49	79		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					73	70			
ELP Progress	56	50	40	64	77	76	54		

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	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	400
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	667
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	43			
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	2	
HSP	67			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	86			
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	38	Yes	3	
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	68			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	85			
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	66			69			63	67	79			56
SWD	30			39			24	42	82		5	
ELL	46			58			20	57	60		6	56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			50			32	30			4	
HSP	67			70			62	70	76		6	56
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	79			86			86	89	92		5	
FRL	56			61			46	55	67		6	45

| 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	70	63	50	66	72	58	63	79	82			64
SWD	31	43	36	25	49	44	17	56				
ELL	54	60	50	49	63	53	50	69	90			64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	33	31	26	47	43	30	50				
HSP	72	65	55	68	73	60	63	81	81			64
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	90	72		88	85		81	91	90			
FRL	64	61	47	59	67	50	53	70	79			60

| 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	55	36	60	36	29	50	80	79			54
SWD	18	24	21	22	23	21	20	43				
ELL	57	52	43	51	32	34	13	78	70			54

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**
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26	25	11	22	22	23	13	36				
HSP	69	57	42	61	36	30	50	84	78			52
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80	61		73	41		73	81	85			
FRL	59	49	33	51	33	27	40	73	76			53

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	56%	50%	6%	47%	9%
08	2023 - Spring	57%	51%	6%	47%	10%
06	2023 - Spring	65%	50%	15%	47%	18%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2023 - Spring	71%	58%	13%	54%	17%
07	2023 - Spring	57%	48%	9%	48%	9%
08	2023 - Spring	59%	59%	0%	55%	4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2023 - Spring	46%	40%	6%	44%	2%

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	90%	52%	38%	48%	42%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	65%	34%	63%	36%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	68%	-4%	66%	-2%

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.

Upon reviewing, student assessment results the lowest test performance was in 8th Grade Science. Overall, students performing levels 3 and above decreased by 2 percentage points from 48% to 46%. A deep dive of the data and implemented strategies will be reviewed to identify instructional areas of improvent and remediation. Identiiyng low performing standards and conducting spiral reviews will be essential in increasing student achievement.

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

Upon reviewing, student assessment results the lowest test performance was in the Civics EOCs. Overall, students performing levels 3 and above decreased by 14 percentage points from 78% to 64% scoring Level 3 and above. A significant factor in the decline of achievement points was due to the loss of veteran Civics teachers and the learning/implementing of best practices of Civics content and standards for teachers assigned Civics this past year. In addition, when compared to previous year's results, 7th and 8th grade ELA demonstrated a significant decrease on achievement. Seventh grade

ELA declined 11 percentage points and eighth grade ELA declined 15 percentage points. Due to inconsistent and interruption of instruction, effective teaching practices were not implemented.

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.

When compared to the state average, the greatest gap was in the Civics EOC – state average was 67% and our school averaged 64% high achievement.

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

Test results demonstrated mathematics as the most improved area. Overall, students in grades 6-8 improved an average of 14 percentage points scoring Levels 3 and above. The math department/ teachers implemented iXL with fidelity and monitored student progress, conducted data reviews, continuously collaborated and shared best practices.

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

Reflecting EWS, potential areas of concern are the number of students scoring Level 1 in Reading and Math and identifying strategies to support and remediate instruction.

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

After reviewing school data results from the 2022-2023 FAST Assessments and EOCs, highest priority ranking will be:
1. 7th Grade Civics
2. 8th Grade Science
3. Overall ELA/Reading
4. ESSA Subgroups SWD and Black

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 Social Studies

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 EOC Civics exam data, 64% of the 7th graders were proficient in Civics as compared to the 2021-2022 results of 78% proficiency. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of instructional inconsistencies and staffing issues, we will implement the targeted element of Benchmark Aligned Instruction.

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

With the implementation of Data-Driven Instruction, the 2023-2024 Civics EOC student scores will increase by 10% points for a total proficiency of 74% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Civics teachers will review data following district mini assessments and mid-year assessments, to make adjustments to instructional practice in Civics courses. Ms. Powell, AP and Ms. Izaguirre, Principal will conduct data chats with teachers to identify low performing benchmarks for remediation and reteaching.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Odette Powell (244980@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 Social Studies, our school will focus on the Evidence-based Intervention of Data-Driven Instruction. This is an educational approach that relies on the teacher's use of student performance data to inform instructional planning and delivery. This systematic approach of instruction uses assessment, analysis, and actions to meet students' needs. Data-Driven Instruction may include developing Instructional Focus Calendars (IFC) to inform teachers on specific standards to target during instruction throughout the year, based on data outcomes.

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

Social Studies teachers will use data acquired from assessments to align instruction to low-performing benchmarks. This evidence-based strategy ensures cohesive instruction . This empowers all in promoting and achieving our goal of attaining a 10 -point increase of achievement level for all 7th grade Civics students by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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.

Scheduled data chat debriefings after mini-assessments for collaborative data analysis on deficient benchmarks. As a result, Civics teachers will build content and standards knowledge through collaborative sessions.

Person Responsible: Odette Powell (244980@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

Schedule professional development sessions on benchmark alignment based on deficient standards. As a result, teachers will effectively target needed standards.

Person Responsible: Fabiola Izaguirre (pr6881@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

Civics teachers will implement i-Civics and set targeted focused benchmarks. As a result, teachers will be able to monitor students' standard progress.

Person Responsible: Odette Powell (244980@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

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

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

According to the 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. and NGSS data, and 2021-2022 ESSA subgroup data summary, the ESSA subgroups below 41% proficiency in consecutive years are SWD and Black. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of low reading comprehension and consistent implementation of ESE strategies, we will implement the targeted element of Differentiated Instruction.

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

With the implementation of differentiated instruction strategies, the 2023-2024 F.A.S.T. ELA and NGSS Science scores will reflect a 5 percentage point increase in SWD and Black subgroups achievement by the end of the 2023-2024 school year. With the implementation of scaffolding, an additional 10% (for a total of 50%) of the middle school population will score at grade level or above in area of ELA, an additional 15% in the area of mathematics (for a total of 45%), an additional 15% in the area of science (for a total of 48%) by 2022-2023 state assessment by June 2023.

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

ELA and Science teachers will review data following Progress Monitoring assessments and district assessments, respectively, to make adjustments to the differentiation of instruction for the SWD and Black subgroups. Ms. Odette Powell, Dr. Perez-Sanz, Assistant Principals and Ms. Fabiola Izaguirre, Principal will conduct data chats with teachers to identify low performing standard groups for reteaching and remediation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Fabiola Izaguirre (pr6881@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 ESSA SWD and Black subgroups, our school will focus on the Evidence-based Intervention of: Differentiated Instruction. This strategy will be used to increase access points for ELA and Science benchmarks in terms of acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials so all students can learn effectively regardless of difference in ability.

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

ELA and Science teachers will differentiate instruction by differentiating the acquisition of content, process, and/or product for all learners. This evidence-based strategy benefits a wide variety of students, especially SWD and Black. This empowers all in promoting and achieving our goal of attaining a 5 -point increase of achievement level for SWD and Black by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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.

ELA and Science teachers will review SWD and Black data from Science Baseline and FAST PMI assessments. As a result, teachers will implement differentiated instructional practices to target low performing standards.

Person Responsible: Odette Powell (244980@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

Science and ELA teachers will utilize supplemental programs such as Gizmos and i-Ready to scaffold instruction and create targeted lessons for remediation and support. As a result, teacher will utilize programs to monitor students' progress.

Person Responsible: Fabiola Izaguirre (pr6881@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

ELA and Science teachers will participate in differentiated instruction professional growth sessions/ presentations in order to effectively implement strategies. As a result, teachers will be able to provide differentiated instructional practices to target instruction.

Person Responsible: Odette Powell (244980@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

#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.

Analysis of the 2022-2023 and the 2021-2022 School Climate Survey two-year comparison showed a 4% decrease in the number of students who agreed that students at the school followed the rules and a 2% increase in the number of students who disagreed with that statement. The percentage of students who agreed or strongly agreed was 23% in 2023 and 27% in 2022. Correspondingly disconcerting, the amount of staff members who answered "All the Time" or "Some of the Time" to the prompt "When my students exhibit early warning indicators or disruptive behaviors, they are provided interventions" was 88% in 2023. This is a decrease in the "All the Time" band of 14%. With the element of discipline in mind, we will implement Response to Early Warning Systems.

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

With the implementation of response to early warning systems, the 2023-2024 School Climate Survey scores will reflect a 5% point increase in the number of students who agreed that students followed the rules and a 15% point increase in the amount of staff members who answer that students exhibiting early warning indicators are provided interventions "All the Time" in the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Following the Code of Student and Discipline Plan, Administration (Ms. Odette Powell, Dr. Ingrid Perez-Sanz and Ms. Fabiola Izaguirre) and Safety Committee Team will review and share attendance and discipline data with faculty, in order to identify students and implement supportive/corrective actions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Fabiola Izaguirre (pr6881@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.)

With the Targeted Element of EWS, our school will focus on the Evidence-based strategy of Response to Early Warning Systems (EWS). This strategy involves establishing a system based on student data to identify students who exhibit behavior or academic performance that puts them at risk of dropping out of school. Response to EWS utilizes predictive data, identifies off-track or at-risk students, targets interventions, and reveals patterns and root causes.

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

With the targeted element of EWS, our school will focus on identifying at risk students and implement time effective practices in order to minimize students' negative behavior and poor academic performance.

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.

After participating in grade leveled orientations, defining expectations and school procedures, students and teachers will become familiar with rules and guidelines. As a result, students will be informed regarding actions and consequences.

Person Responsible: Fabiola Izaguirre (pr6881@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

Staff will participate in Code of Student Conduct and school safety procedures presentations. As a result, teachers will be familiar with progressive discipline steps and school-wide policies.

Person Responsible: Fabiola Izaguirre (pr6881@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

Teachers will review students' accommodations via IEP At-A-Glance and 504 Accommodations and become familiar with student's backgrounds and abilities. As a result, classroom environments will be more conducive to individual student needs.

Person Responsible: Fabiola Izaguirre (pr6881@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

According to the 2022-2023 ELA PM3 data pertaining to reading across genres and vocabulary, 19% of sixth graders were deficient by two or more grade levels, and 23% of seventh and eighth graders were deficient by two or more grade levels. Based on the data and identified contributing factors of a lack of rigor transference

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

With the implementation of Data-Driven Instruction, the 2022-2023 FAST ELA PM3 student scores will increase by 3% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Teachers will interpret data after the ELA PM1 to make adjustments to instruction focusing on areas of need. The administration (Ms. Powell, Dr. Perez-Sanz APs and Ms. Izaguirre, Principal) will conduct quarterly data chats. Data will be shared across the department and grade level teams. Professional development, teacher practices and collaboration will be adjusted to implement research based instructional strategies to reinforce learning gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Fabiola Izaguirre (fizaguirre@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 ELA, our school will focus on the Evidence based-strategy of: Data-driven instruction to assess students' academic performance, to quantify students' rate of improvement, and to evaluate effectiveness of instruction.

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

ELA teachers will use data acquired from assessments to align instruction to low-performing benchmarks. This evidence-based strategy ensures cohesive instruction . This empowers all in promoting and achieving our goal of attaining a 3-point increase of achievement level for all ELA students by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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 Building Strategies for Comprehension that will focus reading and vocabulary best practices. As a result, teachers will implement content based comprehension strategies.

Person Responsible: Fabiola Izaguirre (pr6881@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

Students will participate in FAST PMI assessments allowing teacher to review data, identifying areas of need for reteaching and remediation. As a result, teachers will reinforce low performing standards.

Person Responsible: Fabiola Izaguirre (pr6881@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

Teachers will develop on-going Academic Word Walls focused on content vocabulary and usage. As a result, teachers will reinforce technical vocabulary and content application throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Fabiola Izaguirre (pr6881@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

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 order to meet students academic needs, various extended learning opportunities are offered throughout the school year. These interventions include: before and after-school tutoring through the use of ESSER funds, after-school Community School math and reading classes, and Tittle III funds for academic support in the content areas.