Robert Renick Educational Center School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Robert Renick Educational Center

2201 NW 207TH ST, Opa Locka, FL 33056

http://robertrenick.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.

Robert Renick Educational Center (RREC) provides students with access to research-based curriculum delivered through a variety of teaching practices which is infused with technology. RREC infuses therapeutic strategies into all aspects of the school to insure that the needs of its students are being met both academically and emotionally.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Robert Renick Educational Center (RREC) is a school for students with emotional/behavioral disabilities that strives to encompass the needs of the whole child by offering an integrated educational and therapeutic approach to our students and their families.

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
Marrero, Aisha	Principal	As the school's principal, Mrs. Marrero provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. Data is utilized to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Mrs. Marrero establishes high expectations for all students, and ensures that the school based team is implementing MultiTiered System of Supports (MTSS).
Somoza, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Somoza works in collaboration with the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. She ensures fidelity of the MTSS monitoring by evaluating the following: instructional staff implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development to meet faculty needs.
Berenguer, Laura	Teacher, ESE	Self-contained, high school, ESE Teacher of ACCESS students. Also a team leader for the InD and ASD department.
Cordero, Sarai	Other	Program Specialist who makes sure all IEPs are in compliance. Also, schedules interims and transition meetings and works with outside providers. She is also the digital innovator and a member of the PLST.
Hollerman, Natasha	Attendance/ Social Work	As a school social worker, Mrs. Hollerman is an important part of the MTSS Team that uses data-based problem solving to integral academic and behavioral instruction and interventions. She provides support to individuals and small groups of students.
Jackson, Joy	Teacher, K-12	ESE music teacher who renders services to students in grade K-12. Additionally, she is the middle school team leader and heads our Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) efforts.
Jefferson, David	Dean	Mr. Jefferson is the Dean of Discipline and is responsible for handling disciplinary referrals and providing structure and guidance in the CSI room.
Stewart, Vanessa	Staffing Specialist	Dr. Stewart schedules and holds meetings to ascertain if we are the proper placement for a given child. She is a member of the M-Team that determines is a child is appropriate for Robert Renick Educational Center which is the most restrictive educational placement in M-DCPS. She is also our Mentor Teacher and is a member of the PLST.
Wrentz, Scherita	Teacher, ESE	Science teacher and grade level chair, Ms. Wrentz acts as the liaison for her grade level and supports the implementation of the MTSS process. She is also the Testing Chairperson as well as a member of the PLST.

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.

All stakeholder's are invited to all EESAC meetings where the School Improvement Plan is reviewed and suggestions are solicited. The faculty and leadership team have first hand knowledge and input for the development of the SIP. Ideas and suggestions are continually being incorporated as the SIP is developed.

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))

Data is constantly being desegregated so that the most accurate goals are being addressed on the School Improvement plan in order to most positively address the needs of the students, staff, and school climate. School Teams and Departments meet weekly to discuss and determine the best implementation plan for students not showing adequate progress and thus revising the SIP to reflect the changes in instruction, implementation, and/or rewards systems.

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)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	88%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: COMMENDABLE

	2018-19: MAINTAINING
	2017-18: MAINTAINING
	2016-17: MAINTAINING
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	2	3	0	6	4	2	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	0	5	0	0	8
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	1	2	3	0	5	2	2	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	1	2	3	0	5	2	2	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	2	3	0	5	2	2	15

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	1	2	3	0	5	2	2	15

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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	9
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	24

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	1	1	1	0	2	20

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	2	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7

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	2	1	1	0	2	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	3
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	5
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	7

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	1	1	1	0	2	5

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	0	61	53	37	62	55	25		
ELA Learning Gains				69			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	25	63	55	37	51	42	5		
Math Learning Gains				40			27		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		56	52	23	60	54			
Social Studies Achievement*		77	68	45	68	59			
Middle School Acceleration		75	70		61	51			
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress		62	55		75	70			

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	13
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	25
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	251
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	92
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	13	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

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%
FRL				

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	44			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	43			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	0			25								
SWD	0			25							2	
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	37	69		37	40		23	45				
SWD	41	69		37	40		25	50				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50											
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	38	67		37	40		25	50				

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	25	44		5	27							
SWD	25	44		5	27							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	45		7								
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	25	44		5	27							

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%	*
04	2023 - Spring	*	58%	*	58%	*
06	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	47%	*
03	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	50%	*

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	58%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	*	48%	*	48%	*
03	2023 - Spring	*	63%	*	59%	*
04	2023 - Spring	*	64%	*	61%	*
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%	*

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

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

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	66%	*	63%	*

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.

On the 2022-2023 ELA iReady Diagnostic 1 and 2 scores, 100% of students testing in the 3rd grade, 5th grade, and 8th grades showed 3+ years of below grade level performance. There was a decline on the 2022-2023 ELA iReady Diagnostic scores with 4th grade students testing 100% at 1 year below grade level performance on Diagnostic 1 to 50% at 1 year grade level performance and 50% at 3+ years of below grade level performance on Diagnostic 2. Due to the severity of each students' disability, there could be a plethora of contributing factors that may have lead to the low performance trends. These trends could stem from a child emotional health, home/foster/group home placement, trauma, incarceration and hospitalizations.

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

On the Algebra I EOC, all students scored a level 1 (8 students) with scaled scores ranging from 425-480. Students all have an emotional behavioral disability and often have a secondary and tertiary disability that often inhibit students from reaching their maximum educational potential.

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.

On the math FAST assessment, all students in grades 3-5 (4 students) scored a level 1 (4 students) which is below the state average. Students all have an emotional behavioral disability and often have a secondary and tertiary disability that often inhibit students from reaching their maximum educational potential.

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

On the ELA FAST assessment, all students in grades 3-5 (4 students) had a SS increase from PM2 to PM3 ranging from 8 to 45 points. Increased ELA FAST support as well as small group interventions continued to be implemented for the 2022-2023 school year.

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

The greatest potential areas of concern include attendance below 90%, one or more suspensions, and retained 2 or more years.

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

1. Increase FAST ELA and Math SS grades 3-5
2. Increase Algebra I ECO Level 2 or higher
3. Decrease the number of students with 31+ days absent (55% school average in comparison to the district average of 8%).
4. Increase the accuracy and implementation of the FBA/SEBIP Development
5. Increase school morale

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 Small Group Instruction

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

According to the 2022-2023 ELA iReady Diagnostic 1 and 2 scores, 100% of students in grades 3, 5, and 8 showed three plus years of below grade level performance. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of lack of student engagement, differentiated instruction, and below average student attendance records, we will implement specific strategies and initiatives to improve ELA iReady scores.

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

By providing opportunities for teachers to further develop their data-driven instructional knowledge and implementation to build upon student strengths and improve student weaknesses, Fifty percent of participating 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students (8 students in all) will have ELA iReady Diagnostic scores showing that they are performing less than 3 years below grade level, on grade level, or above by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Rattler Best Practices Thursdays, department, team and cross-curriculum meetings that encompass Data-Driven Instruction strategies to deepen teacher understanding and implementation will be monitored by agendas and sign-in sheets, teacher attendance of district held DI professional development sessions, evidence of differentiated instruction in lesson plans and during administrative walk-throughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Somoza (nsomoza@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.)

Data-Driven Instruction 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.

Data-driven instruction can transform classrooms and allows teachers to be more responsive to students, and can help make instruction more relevant and customized. Data-driven instruction also provides an opportunity to address weaknesses and strengths in curriculum design, teaching methods, and student groupings.

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 "Rattler Best Practices Thursdays" where various data-driven instructional strategies will be shared as evidenced by meeting agendas and sign-in sheets.

Person Responsible: Nicole Somoza (nsomoza@dadeschools.net)

By When: Thursday, August 24, 2023-Ongoing

School-led professional development sessions will be facilitated based on Data-driven instructional strategies.

Person Responsible: Aisha Marrero (amarrero@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 27, 2023

Provide modeling opportunities for teachers to observe their peers implementing data-driven instructional strategies in their classrooms.

Person Responsible: Nicole Somoza (nsomoza@dadeschools.net)

By When: Thursday, August 17, 2023-Ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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

According to the 2022-2023 Algebra I EOCs, all students (8 students in total)scored a level 1 with scaled scores ranging from 425-480. Based on data and the identified contributing factors of lack of student engagement, differentiated instruction, and below average student attendance records, we will implement specific strategies and initiatives to improve student engagement and Algebra I EOC test scores.

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

By providing opportunities for teachers to further develop their differentiated instructional knowledge and implementation to build upon student strengths and improve student weaknesses, 50% of students will score a level 2 or higher on the Algebra I EOC by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Rattler Best Practices Thursdays, department, team and cross-curriculum meetings that encompass differentiated instruction strategies to deepen teacher DI implementation will be monitored by agendas and sign-in sheets, teacher attendance of district held DI professional development sessions, evidence of differentiated instruction in lesson plans and during administrative walk-throughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Somoza (nsomoza@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of: acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability. Research demonstrates this method benefits a wide range of students.

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

To increase teacher knowledge and understanding of students' strengths and weaknesses so that a greater level of student achievement can be obtained as it pertains to basic academic skills and progress.

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.

Presenting differentiated instruction implementation strategies at Rattler Best Practice Thursday sessions and will occur monthly.

Person Responsible: Nicole Somoza (nsomoza@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17, 2023 - Ongoing

Utilizing IEP data effectively in the classroom to assist with individual student needs will be reviewed and analyzed during common planning, team meetings, and department meetings so that instruction may be differentiated to each child's unique needs.

Person Responsible: Nicole Somoza (nsomoza@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17, 2023 - Ongoing

Provide modeling opportunities for teachers to observe their peers implementing differentiated instruction strategies in their classrooms.

Person Responsible: Nicole Somoza (nsomoza@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17, 2023 - Ongoing

#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.

According to the 2022-2023 school climate survey, 63% of staff members felt that school personnel worked together as a team. Based on the data from the 2021-2022 school climate survey that indicated 70% of staff members felt that school personnel worked together as a team, which is a decline of 8.09% from the previous year, the identified contributing factors of lack of employee interest, resistance to change and negative feelings surrounding the workplace, we will implement specific strategies and initiatives to improve school morale.

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

With the implementation of new staff incentives, team building activities, modeling opportunities and focus groups, the 2023-2024 school climate survey will indicated that 75% of staff member or more will feel that school personnel work together as a team and increase the feeling of empowerment.

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

Weekly and monthly incentives as well as positive initiatives/trainings/team building activities will be implemented with fidelity throughout the school year to empower staff. This will be monitored by leadership meeting agendas, PBIS monthly calendar, and monthly school calendar of events.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Somoza (nsomoza@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.)

Empowering Teachers and Staff to work together as a team to provide support for teachers, students, staff to be leaders, innovators, risk-takers, and designers of new ways to approach challenges.

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

By continuing to increase staff, student, and school morale, these strategies will promote positive student behavior and student engagement and the decrease of disciplinary referrals. Thus, this will promote a more positive work environment and positive energy throughout the school building; thus empowering teachers and staff.

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

Tier 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.

Positive monthly mantras will be posted in the main office and various incentives (i.e. treats) will be given to staff/student to support the positive monthly mantra.

Person Responsible: Nicole Somoza (nsomoza@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17, 2023-Ongoing

Adoption and implementation of "The No Complaining Rule" initiative will take place with daily reminders, affirmations, motivational techniques and treats to improve overall school morale.

Person Responsible: Nicole Somoza (nsomoza@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17, 2023-Ongoing

Staff will be able to participate in team building activities both during school hours and after school hours that focus on positivity and gratitude to promote a more positive school culture.

Person Responsible: Natasha Hollerman (hollerman@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17, 2023-Ongoing

#4. 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 School Climate Survey, 56% of staff members felt our school disciplined all students fairly. Based on the comparison data from the 2021-2022 School Climate Survey 88% of staff members felt our school disciplined all students fairly, a decline of 22%. The contributing factors that lead to this decline include continuous classroom disruptions, teacher perception, and the lack of shared knowledge as it pertains to the Student Code of Conduct. We will implement specific initiative to improve the overall perception of fair discipline and equity schoolwide.

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

With the implementation of a Discipline and Safety Committee, generating roles and holding staff accountable, and increase meetings that involve the deciphering of the Student Code of Conduct, 75% of staff member will feel that our school disciplines all students fairly based on the 2023-2024 school climate survey.

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

This will be monitored by administrative walk-throughs and teacher/staff check-ins after student infractions, data chats at Safety and Discipline Committee meetings and department meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

David Jefferson (dj09737@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.)

School discipline addresses schoolwide, classroom, and individual student needs through broad prevention, targeted intervention, and development of self-discipline. Following and sharing the Student Code of Conduct with faculty and staff, as well as implementing the development of the Safety and Discipline Committee will ensure that student infractions are handled fairly, effectively, and efficiently.

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

This strategy will streamline the discipline process and make all willing stakeholder knowledgeable and accountable for the disciplinary actions that occur after a student infraction.

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.

Assembly of Safety and Discipline Committee which will encompass staff volunteers that hold various positions to ensure that the needs of the students are being properly addressed.

Person Responsible: Aisha Marrero (amarrero@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17, 2023 - Ongoing

Enforcing the roles and job duties of staff members responsible for safety and discipline as well as holding all accountable .

Person Responsible: Aisha Marrero (amarrero@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17, 2023 - Ongoing

Conduct monthly Safety and Discipline Team meetings where problem solving sessions can take place and to ensure that all voices are being heard to address the discipline/safety concerns within the school.

Person Responsible: Aisha Marrero (amarrero@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 17, 2023 - Ongoing

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).

N/A

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

We had 1 second grade student enrolled during the 2022-2023 school year. The student scored a level 1 on the state F.AS.T. as well as three or more grade levels below on the iReady assessments.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

According to the 2022-2023 ELA iReady Diagnostic 1 and 2 scores, 100% of students in grades 3-5 showed three plus years of below grade level performance and scored a Level one on the PM1, PM2, and PM3 2022-2023 F.A.S.T Assessment.

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

By implementing differentiated reading strategies, 60% of the kindergarten through second grade students will show at lest a one level increase on the PM1 to the PM3 F.A.S.T. 2023-2024 statewide, standardized English Language Arts Assessment (on PowerBi).

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By implementing differentiated reading strategies, 60% of the third through fifth grade students will show at lest a one level increase on the PM1 to the PM3 F.A.S.T. 2023-2024 statewide, standardized English Language Arts Assessment (on PowerBi).

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

This area of focus will be monitored by tracking i-Ready usage and testing results, review of student grades and progress during IEP meetings, RT meetings, parent conferences and weekly, and department meetings, faculty participation in District lead trainings and weekly collaboration with ELA department members. PM1 and PM2 F.A.S.T. data will also be desegregated to target areas of weakness.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Concepcion, Jessica, jconcepcion@dadeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of: acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

By effectively utilizing Differentiated instruction strategies we hope to maximize possible achievement for all learners by targeted their individualized weaknesses to improve test scores. All of our students (grades 3-5) are all reading below grade level and are not active and strategic readers, which indicates the need for a more specific differentiated instruction strategy implementation. By having teachers attend available District and school lead professional development sessions encompassing differentiated instruction strategies will enable our instructional staff to provide high quality instruction.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Teacher will decipher 2022-2023 school year data to put together a differentiated plan to address each students' weakness.	Concepcion, Jessica, jconcepcion@dadeschools.net
Teacher will closely monitor PM1 and PM2 data as well as iReady data to determine if the students' area(s) of weaknesses are improving and if further intensive instruction is needed or if there is another area of concern that will need to be addressed.	Concepcion, Jessica, jconcepcion@dadeschools.net
Teacher will specifically tailor daily small group sessions targeting student weaknesses as well as providing a foundation to build upon strengths.	Concepcion, Jessica, jconcepcion@dadeschools.net
Daily read alouds will be implemented to assist in student fluency and comprehension.	Concepcion, Jessica, jconcepcion@dadeschools.net
A minimum of 60 minutes of i-Ready per week for each student will be monitored for growth and/or additional areas of concern.	Concepcion, Jessica, jconcepcion@dadeschools.net
Teacher will attend district wide professional development sessions to improve both differentiation strategies as well as curriculum usage.	Concepcion, Jessica, jconcepcion@dadeschools.net

Title I Requirements

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

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

The AIP, UniSIG budget and SWP will be disseminated to stakeholders via EESAC meetings as well as through faculty meetings, team/department meetings, Parent meetings and conferences, as well as during Open house and other family activities held throughout the school year.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Various parent involvement activities will be held throughout the school year to offer support (i.e. U R Not Alone Parent Breakfast) as well as activities celebrating their child's successes and community activities involving various outside stakeholders..

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Each teacher will participate in district-led professional development sessions in their specific core subject area. Additionally, teachers will patriciate in de-escalation and Safe Crisis Management trainings. School-wide Rattler Best Practices sessions will occur monthly and will delve deeper into specific differentiated instruction strategies to best address the needs of their students.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The family activities offered at the school will provide educational, nutritional, and career education to stakeholders.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Weekly counseling sessions are provided to all students as well as art therapy sessions (if delineated on the student IEP). Group sessions on bullying prevention and mindfulness also occur on a monthly basis. School-wide cultural activities occur each marking period where students are able to showcase their work. Special Olympics, Arts4All, and the Food Forest all are active participates at Robert Renick Educational Center.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Students are provided the opportunity to participate in Project Victory as well participate in on-campus post-secondary living scenarios that include real world settings, cooking, and daily skills.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Robert Renick Educational Center is a Positive Behavioral Intervention School that provides incentives for student's displaying positive behavior throughout the school day. Incentives include Fun Fridays, field trips, point store, and activity room privileges.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Teachers have the opportunity to attend district-wide professional development sessions to improve their instructional strategies as well as improve their use of data in their classrooms. Teachers also attend weekly Rattler Best Practices Thursday to improve overall instructional growth.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No