

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Here's Help 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>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>0</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>

## Here's Help

15100 NW 27TH AVE, Opa Locka, FL 33054

outreach.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.**

To provide educational, life skills to include social-emotional services to meet the diverse needs of our students.

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

Through our educational, life skills and social emotional services students use these services to successfully re-integrate into society.

### 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
Clark, Theron	Principal	As a principal, Theron Clark serves as the school's instructional leader. Dr. Clark provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. He uses data to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings.
Lafaille, Eddy	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principal, Mr. Lafaille assists the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. He monitors and evaluates the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and alignment of the professional development to faculty needs.
Lewis, Felicia	Reading Coach	As an instructional coach, Ms. Lewis provides support to the Reading/ELA teacher in the classroom. She also provides intervention to students using data to provide enrichment and remediation to students. She collaborates with the teacher to plan and implement data-driven instruction and provide intervention and enrichment to students.
Antonini, Enrique	Math Coach	As an instructional coach, Mr. Antonini provides support to the Math teacher in the classroom. He also provides intervention to students using data to provide enrichment and remediation to students. He collaborates with the Math teacher to plan and implement data-driven instruction and provide intervention and enrichment to students.
Alonso, Nadeshka	Other	As the Testing Coordinator, Ms. Alonso oversees the preparations and administration of all standardized tests.
Posey, Renee	School Counselor	As a School Counselor, Dr. Posey is responsible for assisting with the master schedule, supporting students' social and emotional well-being, reviewing student courses and monitoring student readiness for graduation.
Dunn, Yeasha	Teacher, K-12	As a K-12 teacher, Ms. Dunn provides instruction in English Language Arts, Reading, and Mathematics. She is responsible for sharing pertinent information between administration and the other teacher at the site.

### Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The program is an affiliating agreement program. Program staff are included in the SIP process through discussions with the instructional staff.

**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))

Teachers and administrators will monitor the progress of the SIP goals.

**Demographic Data**

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	[Data Not Available]
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	0%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	2017-18: MAINTAINING
<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	0	0	1	1	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

**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
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

**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 school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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	0	0	0	

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

## 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*		55	50		54	51			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*		43	38		42	38			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		62	64		41	40			
Social Studies Achievement*		69	66		56	48			
Middle School Acceleration					56	44			
Graduation Rate		89	89		56	61	0		
College and Career Acceleration		70	65		67	67			
ELP Progress		49	45						

*\* 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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
FRL				

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

**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**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												

## 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
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

## 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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

## 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										0		
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

**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
10	2023 - Spring	*	54%	*	50%	*
07	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	47%	*
08	2023 - Spring	*	51%	*	47%	*
09	2023 - Spring	*	51%	*	48%	*

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	*	48%	*	48%	*
08	2023 - Spring	*	59%	*	55%	*

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

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

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

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

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Based on the Data from the 2023 FAST PM3 assessments, 100% of reading students in grade 7, and 50% of students in grade 8 showed the lowest performance with students scoring at proficient level 1 and 50 % of 8th grade students scoring at proficient level 2.

Trend data shows 7 students fell below the State's threshold for Level 1. Students become stagnate because of the lack of comparative data.

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

Reading for grade 7 students.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

In comparison with the state average, the 2023 grades 7 and 8 FAST ELA Reading scores for level 1 students

showed the greatest gap with the state average at 32% and our schools data indicating 100%. Based on the data collected in the Read 180 program a major contributing factor in students reading comprehension was limited vocabulary.

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

Based on the FAST Reading assessment middle grades students improved one proficiency level from a level 1 to a level 2 from PM2 to PM3. The actions implemented by the school included enrolling students in an intensive reading course and using Read 180 for all level 1 students.

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

The schools main area of concern based on the EWS data is that 100% of the 7th grade students have a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. These students are entering the program already reading below grade level.

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

Improve assessment performance in Math  
Improve assessment performance in Reading/ELA



Provide teachers with professional learning in Differentiated Instruction  
Increase the frequency of Differentiated Instruction in both Reading and Math

### 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 Differentiation

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

The area of focus at Here's Help for 2023-2024 will be differentiated instruction in the classroom by the instruction teacher and the instructional mathematics coach.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of students will be assessed in mathematics upon entry to the program during the 2023-24 school year

#### Monitoring:

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

The focus area will be monitored by having the students tested every 30 days on the STAR testing platform to monitor their gains/ loses. This will be done in conjunction with the states PM system of exams.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Yeasha Dunn (yeasha@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 of intervention will be by the using of results from the STAR exams and the PM exams to establish an intervention plan for each student to use iXL as the computer component and mini lessons to implement student differentiated instruction in small groups.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rational for the Evidence based intervention plan is based on student needs and teacher subject limitations for using STAR exam, iXL and mini lessons to best assist to the students individual needs.

#### 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.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

As per the 2022-2023 FAST PM3 data, it was observed that 100% of the 7th and 8th grade students, attained a

level 1 on the FAST ELA Assessment. Given this data and the factors identified as contributors, including a notable concentration of level 1 results, it's apparent that student readiness levels posed limitations in mastering grade-level tasks. Consequently, the main emphasis will be on implementing differentiated instructional strategies across all core subjects to address these challenges.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By scheduling all Level 1 students to participate in an intensive reading course and delivering supplementary reading interventions, our goal is to increase student scores by 3 percentage points on the 2024 FAST PM 3 Assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

Instructional Coaches will share assessment results with teachers to ensure fidelity of assessment and development of progress monitoring plans. Student progress will be tracked using data charts displaying their FAST PM 1 and PM 2 data. These charts will highlight areas of concern, allowing for targeted support. Teachers will furnish students with data chats, guiding them through the identified areas of concern and conducting daily interventions to address these specific needs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Theron Clark (tclark@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.)

i-Ready for middle school students

Read 180 for both middle and high school students

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on the teacher's needs assessment surveys, there is a recognized need for professional learning in the realms of differentiated instruction and incorporating data-driven teaching methods. If teachers are equipped with professional learning in these areas, they will be capable of employing visual, auditory, and tactile instructional strategies. This will effectively equip students to attain proficient levels on state assessments.

**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.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Pre and post assessments have not been administered with fidelity.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

100% of students will be assessed in mathematics and ELA upon entry to the program during the 2023-24 school year.

**Monitoring:**

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

Lead teacher will monitor checklist to monitor assessments of students in math.  
Assessment results will be shared with instructional coaches to ensure fidelity of assessment and development of progress monitoring plans.  
Administrator will verify assessment progress

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Theron Clark (tclark@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.)

I-Ready assessments for middle school students  
Edgenuity assessments for high school students

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Review assessment checklists for enrolled and withdrawn students to ensure assessments are administered with fidelity.

**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.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*