

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Colegiate Preparatory Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Colegiate Preparatory Academy

12900 NE 17TH AVENUE, Miami, FL 33181

www.sommersetvirtual.academy.com

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.

The mission of Colēgiate Preparatory Academy is to produce self-directed and responsible life-long learners through the delivery of a high-quality public digital learning program emphasizing communication processes, technologies, and techniques that will prepare students for the demands of the 21st century workforce

Provide the school's vision statement.

Colegiate Preparatory Academy promotes a culture that maximizes student achievement and fosters the development of responsible, self-directed lifelong learners in a safe and enriching environment.

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
Iglesias, Noelle	Principal	Responsible for overseeing the operations, educational quality, and overall success of the virtual school. Key job duties include: Educational leadership, teacher supervision and evaluation, student support, data analysis, and parent and community engagement.

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.

Team met to use data and develop a school improvement plan to better serve the subgroups below the 41%. The goal is to create a comprehensive plan that addresses the unique needs and challenges of the school while garnering support and ownership from all relevant parties.

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))

Monitoring the SIP's implementation and impact is crucial for ensuring its effectiveness and making necessary adjustments for continuous improvement. Team will meet quarterly to develop and monitor the implementation of the SIP. The school will continue to collect data, monitor progress, analyze

outcomes, and revise the plan based on the feedback. This ensures that the SIP remains responsive to changing needs and evolving circumstances.

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)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	67%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	4%
Charter School	Yes
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)	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: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	
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	1	3	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	16	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	11	20	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	16	

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	2	2	10	14

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	1	0	1

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	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	1	0	1	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	10	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6	

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	3	1	2	6

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	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*	56	55	50	68	54	51			
ELA Learning Gains				56					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54					
Math Achievement*	29	43	38	37	42	38			
Math Learning Gains				41					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				29					

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	38	62	64	44	41	40			
Social Studies Achievement*	70	69	66	53	56	48			
Middle School Acceleration				27	56	44			
Graduation Rate	88	89	89		56	61			
College and Career Acceleration	77	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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	358
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	92
Graduation Rate	88

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	409
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	95
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	68			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	46			
FRL	89			

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				
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	47			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	46			

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	56			29			38	70		88	77	
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	69			29			50	83		86	6	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	48			37			36	62			4	
FRL										92	2	

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	68	56	54	37	41	29	44	53	27			
SWD												
ELL	50	41		28	39							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43	41		17	50		30					
HSP	69	58	62	40	40	24	46	61	25			
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	91			60								
FRL	65	53	57	33	36	18	50	57				

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												
SWD												
ELL												

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												
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	50%	54%	-4%	50%	0%
07	2023 - Spring	74%	50%	24%	47%	27%
08	2023 - Spring	58%	51%	7%	47%	11%
09	2023 - Spring	51%	51%	0%	48%	3%
06	2023 - Spring	54%	50%	4%	47%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	33%	58%	-25%	54%	-21%
07	2023 - Spring	73%	48%	25%	48%	25%
08	2023 - Spring	28%	59%	-31%	55%	-27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	23%	40%	-17%	44%	-21%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	22%	56%	-34%	50%	-28%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	22%	52%	-30%	48%	-26%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	46%	65%	-19%	63%	-17%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	68%	6%	66%	8%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	66%	-3%	63%	0%

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.

According to the 2023 Data students demonstrated a 29% proficiency in Science. Teaching science in an all virtual setting is extremely difficult because it contains many abstract concepts. Science education

often requires active participation, critical thinking, and problem-solving. If students aren't motivated or encouraged to explore these aspects, their performance might suffer. Differentiation is needed to address the diverse levels.

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

ELA showed the greatest decline from the prior year. English Language Learners may have difficulty accessing content without the support they typically have in your physical classroom.

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.

The area of Science with 29% had the greatest gap compared to the State average which was 50%. Factors that contribute to this gap is teaching in an all virtual setting makes it difficult to explain abstract concepts. Differentiation is needed to address the diverse levels.

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

The area of Math showed the area of most improvement with an increase of 12% from the prior year. In addition to our virtual curriculum we implemented intensive Math courses and IXL. IXL is an online educational platform that offers interactive practice exercises for various subjects, including math.

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

After reflecting on the EWS data from the 2023-2024 school year, we have identified Math as a potential area of concern.

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

Science and Math will be our highest priorities for the upcoming school year.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Attendance in our the live sessions is an area of focus. Attendance in virtual education plays a pivotal role in shaping a positive culture and environment. It facilitates community building, engagement, accountability, positive learning habits, interaction, collaboration, feedback, and mutual support. These factors collectively contribute to an enriching and conducive virtual learning experience. Attending live sessions will help foster a positive school culture and allow better engagement with peers and teachers. Specifically, with our English Language Learners and our black students, this will allow teachers to differentiate instruction to better serve their needs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to increase attendance in live sessions to improve student engagement.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored by having teachers take attendance in live sessions on a daily basis. Every 2 weeks attendance and progress will be monitored. Students and Parents will be notified when students are are not attending the Live Sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Noelle Iglesias (945642@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 Attendance, we will focus on Attendance Initiatives to increase attendance and incentivize students to achieve perfect attendance. The attendance initiatives will include the monitoring and reporting student absences and calling parent/guardians.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our focus on attendance initiatives to address the needs of students that are truant will reduce the percentage of students that have ten or more absences.

There is a direct correlation between being present in school and academic achievement. Regular attendance ensures that students are present to receive the planned lessons, explanations, and demonstrations. This direct interaction with educators allows students to understand concepts, ask questions, and seek clarifications, which in turn enhances their understanding of the subject matter. School attendance allows students to interact with their peers. Peer interactions can lead to collaborative learning, idea sharing, and the development of social skills that are valuable both inside and outside the classroom.

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. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

After reviewing the data, ELL students fell below the Federal Index of 41%. They had an 33% proficiency in Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

A greater emphasis has been placed on our intensive math courses and implementing additional resources such as IXL. Students will achieve a SMART score of 80% in weekly IXL assignments.

Monitoring:

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

Teacher will review the Student Quick View report and reteach concepts until the 80% has been reached.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

According to a 2019 Study, researchers found that students using IXL experienced greater growth on assessments than students without IXL.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

IXL provides feedback and resources on concepts not mastered by the students.

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.

Teacher will assign IXL weekly assignments

Teacher will monitor results for the 80% and adjust instruction as needed.

Person Responsible: Noelle Iglesias (945642@dadeschools.net)

By When:

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**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.

After reviewing the data, Black students fell below the Federal Index of 41%. They had an 8% proficiency in Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

A greater emphasis has been placed on our intensive math courses and implementing additional resources such as IXL. Students will achieve a SMART score of 80% in weekly IXL assignments.

Monitoring:

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

Teacher will review the Student Quick View report and reteach concepts until the 80% has been reached.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

According to a 2019 Study, researchers found that students using IXL experienced greater growth on assessments than students without IXL.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

IXL provides feedback and resources on concepts not mastered by the students.

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.

Teacher will assign IXL weekly assignments

Teacher will monitor results for the 80% and adjust instruction as needed.

Person Responsible: Noelle Iglesias (945642@dadeschools.net)

By When:

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)).

After reviewing the data, two subgroups fell below the Federal Index of 41%. This included an 8% proficiency of Black students and 33% proficiency of ELL students in Math. To address these needs further, a greater emphasis has been placed on our intensive math courses and implementing additional resources such as IXL.