

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Andrea Castillo 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Andrea Castillo Preparatory Academy

10201 NW 78TH ST, Doral, FL 33178

[no web address on file]

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.

Our mission at Andrea Castillo Preparatory Academy is to create an engaging and nurturing environment for all stakeholders that fosters the intellectual and emotional growth of the individual child through quality instruction and meaningful collaboration as they prepare to become a global citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Andrea Castillo Preparatory Academy is to provide a learning environment where our students will: Learn, Engage, Achieve, Discover.

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
Costa, Adolfo	Principal	Oversee the fiscal health of the school budget and the overall well being of the school community.
Gil, Christina	Assistant Principal	Support all the goals set forth by the SIP and maintain a safe and orderly learning environment.

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 stakeholders analyze the annual school data and meet to develop the SIP.

SIP Monitoring

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

The school shares and approves the SIP via the EESAC committee which meets four times a year.

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)	Elementary School PK-1
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	94%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	45%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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)	English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
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	13	14	10	2	0	0	0	0	39	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in Math	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	20	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	6	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	10	16	23	15	0	0	0	0	64	
	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		
	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	4	7	3	0	0	0	0	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	11	17	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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		

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	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	11	17	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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		

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	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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*	48	60	53		62	56			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	71	66	59		58	50			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		58	54		64	59			
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	71	63	59	83					

* 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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	238
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	83
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	83
Total Components for the Federal Index	1
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	45			
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	56			
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	55			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL	83			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	83			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	88			

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	48			71								71
SWD											1	45
ELL	40			60							4	71
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	44			67							4	70
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											1	55

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												83
SWD												
ELL												83
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												83
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												88

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												
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
03	2023 - Spring	39%	52%	-13%	50%	-11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	65%	63%	2%	59%	6%

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.

FAST PM3 ELA- In the three areas assessed, Reading Across Genres & Vocabulary showed the lowest performance with 35% of students scoring below proficiency and 52% at or near proficiency, with none of the standards tested being above proficiency. Context and Connotation and Interpreting Figurative Language were the lowest performing standard group where the students scored below the proficiency standards although the performance was similar to the test as whole.

FAST PM3 Math- In the reporting categories, Geometric Reasoning, Measurement, and Data Analysis & Probability showed the lowest performance with 19% of students scoring below proficiency and 48% at or near proficiency with three standards (MA.3.GR.1.1-1.3) scoring above the proficiency standard. The lowest performing standards which were also weak in comparison to the test as a whole were collecting, representing, and interpreting data by solving one and two step problems, solving perimeter and area of composite figures with whole number side lengths, and solving real world problems utilizing units of measure.

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

We don't have PM3 from last year to compare-this was the only decline from PM1 to PM3 based on the data in Renaissance.

Gr 2 STAR ELA – PM1 proficiency 43.9% PM3 proficiency 37.3% The factor that most contributed to this decline was the number of ELL students who registered after the PM1 assessment.

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.

Gr. 3 FAST ELA – When comparing the data to the state average, the state’s proficiency is at 50% and the school’s is at 39% proficient, 11 percentage points less than the state’s. The most significant difference in the reporting categories is in Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary where the at/above proficiency difference is 13 percentage points with the state scoring 30% and the school 13%. The school’s not proficient percentage was higher than the state average by 13 percentage points with the state average at 22% and the school at 35%.

Gr. 3 FAST Math - When comparing the data to the state average, the school’s percent proficient is greater than the state average overall by 6 percentage points (school 65% / state 59%). The same trend, where the school average is higher than the state, is seen with each reporting category. **Greatest gap with the state average (+)

The state’s STAR Math overall proficiency rate (percent of students estimated to score at or above proficiency rate) is 61.4%. The school’s overall proficiency rate is 76.6%

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

FAST Gr. 3 ELA- From PM1 to PM3 there was an increase of 33 percentage points in proficiency from 6% of students proficient in PM1 to 39% of students proficient in PM3. The component that showed the most improvement from PM1 to PM3 was Reading Across Genres with a decrease of 33 percentage points in students who were not proficient from 68% in PM1 to 35% in PM3. Note-this reporting category is also the lowest scoring overall although it was the one where there was the most improvement.

FAST Gr. 3 Math- From PM1 to PM3 there was an increase of 65 percentage points in proficiency from 0% of students proficient in PM1 to 65% of students proficient in PM3. The component that showed the most improvement from PM1 to PM3 was Fractional Reasoning with a decrease of 77 percentage points in students who were not proficient from 87% in PM1 to 10% in PM3.

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

One of the areas of concern is the number of students with attendance below 10%.

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

1. Student Engagement
2. Student Attendance
3. Standards aligned instruction
4. Reading Proficiency
5. Parental Involvement

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 Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on the data review, our school will implement the target element of attendance initiatives. Through our data review, our overall school attendance percentage was 92.1% which is in the bottom third of K-8 Centers in the Central Region. We recognize the need to tailor our attendance initiatives and improve in making connections with families and the community to ensure attendance is consistently high.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement the Targeted Element of Student Attendance, our students will receive quality instruction that will contribute to improved student outcomes. With consistent monitoring and incentives, our attendance will increase 1 percentage points by June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team will work to connect with families who struggle with attendance and identify the root cause of absences by implementing the District Truancy Plan. The Leadership Team will have parent meetings with all parents in order advise them of attendance guidelines. The Leadership Team will plan regular student incentives to celebrate improved attendance and perfect attendance of students. To ensure we are on track in meeting the outcome, we will include attendance data during data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christina Gil (cctgil@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 Initiative, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of : Attendance Initiatives. Attendance Initiatives will assist in narrowing the absence gap amongst our students. Student absences will be monitored on a daily basis to prevent a pattern of excessive absences.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Attendance initiatives will assist in decreasing the number of student absences. The initiatives will provide the Leadership Team with a systematic approach to identify attendance issues, remediation, and rewards.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

8-14-23 Teachers will explain the importance of consistent student data and our school wide attendance plan to parents during their initial meet and greet. As a result, parents will have a firm understanding of attendance expectations.

Person Responsible: Suzanne Rivero-Setien (sriverosetien@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08-14-2023

09-01-2023 The Leadership Team will meet with teachers to develop an attendance incentive calendar for the first half of the school year. As a result, the leadership team will develop an attendance incentive calendar.

Person Responsible: Christina Gil (cctgil@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09-01-2023

8-14-23 - 09-29-23 The Leadership Team will meet with teachers to identify the students who have been truant during the 2022-23 school year. As a result, the leadership team will be able to proceed with the truancy plan for each student.

Person Responsible: Suzanne Rivero-Setien (sriverosetien@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8-14-23 - 09-29-23

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

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

According to the 2022-2023 FAST PM3 data, 48% of 3rd grade students were proficient in ELA as compared to the state average of 50% and district average of 51%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: high number of ESOL. Student readiness levels limit the ability to master grade level tasks and low student attendance, we will implement the Targeted Element of Student Engagement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Student Engagement, the level of students scoring at proficiency in 3rd grade ELA will increase by a minimum of 5 percentage points as evidenced by the 2024 FAST PM3 assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team will monitor student learning through the use of ongoing progress monitoring, I-Ready, and FAST data. The Leadership Team will conduct quarterly data chats. Follow-up will consist of regular walkthroughs to ensure that data-driven standards-based instruction is taking place with an emphasis on student-centered learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christina Gil (cctgil@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 Student Engagement, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Student-Centered Learning. Student-Centered Learning instruction will assist in targeting the instructional approaches, delivery and academic support strategies based on students' instructional needs. Student progress will be monitored through data-trackers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The term Student-Centered Learning refers to a wide variety of educational programs, learning experiences, instructional approaches, and academic-support strategies (physical or virtual) that are intended to address the distinct learning needs, interests, aspirations, or cultural backgrounds of individual students and groups of 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.

8-14-23 - 09-29-23 Teachers will analyze data using FAST PM1 and I-Ready Diagnostic to determine student individual academic needs. As a result, students will be grouped according to their academic need during teacher led differentiated instruction time.

Person Responsible: Christina Gil (cctgil@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8-14-23 - 09-29-23

8-14-23 - 09-29-23 Provide opportunities for ongoing collaborative conversations to assist teachers' lesson planning. As a result, teachers will attend collaborative planning sessions to share best practices, instructional strategies and approaches. Teachers may also be given an opportunity to conduct a peer-to-peer observation.

Person Responsible: Christina Gil (cctgil@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8-14-23 - 09-29-23

8-14-23 - 09-29-23 The Leadership Team will conduct data chats with teachers to analyze I-Ready and FAST data. As a result, teachers will determine the need for additional interventions.

Person Responsible: Christina Gil (cctgil@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8-14-23 - 09-29-23

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned 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 STAR data, there was a 6.6% decrease in proficiency from PM1 to PM3 in 2nd grade ELA. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: high number of ESOL, recently adopted B.E.S.T. standards, and recently adopted state assessment, we will implement the Targeted Element of Benchmark-Aligned Instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Benchmark-Aligned Instruction, the level of proficiency in 2nd grade STAR ELA will increase by a minimum of 5 percentage points as evidenced by the 2023-2024 PM1 assessment to PM3 assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team will attend collaborative planning sessions to review bi-weekly lesson plans, data-analysis, data-driven conversations, benchmark-aligned resources and fidelity to pacing guides. Administration will conduct regular classroom walkthroughs to ensure quality benchmark-aligned instruction is taking place and timely feedback will be provided to the teacher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christina Gil (cctgil@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 Benchmark-Aligned Instruction, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Data-Driven Instruction. Data-Driven Instruction will assist in targeting benchmark-aligned resources in order to meet students' needs and reach proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

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.

8-14-23 - 09-29-23 During weekly collaborative planning sessions, teachers will share data-analysis of performance matters assessments. As a result, teachers will be able to collaboratively analyze the trends and make modifications to lessons for remediation or acceleration as needed.

Person Responsible: Christina Gil (cctgil@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8-14-23 - 09-29-23

8-14-23 - 09-29-23 Teacher Leaders will attend professional developments provided by the district and share knowledge of benchmark-aligned instruction and best practices during common planning time and faculty meetings. As a result, all teachers will have the updated professional development strategies.

Person Responsible: Christina Gil (cctgil@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8-14-23 - 09-29-23

8-14-23 - 09-29-23 Teachers will continue to monitor student iReady usage and pass rate to ensure that all students are meeting their goals and closing the achievement gap. As a result, student usage and pass rate will increase.

Person Responsible: Christina Gil (cctgil@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8-14-23 - 09-29-23

#4. 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 2023 data reviewed, the FAST PM3 ELA- In the three areas assessed, Reading Across Genres & Vocabulary showed the lowest performance with 35% of students scoring below proficiency and 52% at or near proficiency, with none of the standards tested being above proficiency. Context and Connotation and Interpreting Figurative Language were the lowest performing standard group where the students scored below the proficiency standards although the performance was similar to the test as whole. Based on this data, our school will implement Differentiated Instruction as an area of focus with an emphasis on data-driven differentiated instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

After the implementation of data-driven differentiated instruction, third grade students will show a minimum increase of 3 percentage points when comparing the progress in FAST from PM1 to PM3. In addition, our fourth grade students will show a minimum increase of 3 percentage points when comparing the progress in FAST from PM1 to PM3.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will review FAST data and Performance Matters student data and conduct data chats with the teachers. Follow-up will consist of regular walkthroughs to ensure that data-driven standards-based differentiated instruction is taking place. Data analysis will take place to ensure that students are demonstrating growth. Students will be provided with extended learning opportunities to include before/after school tutoring, interventions, and pull-out services

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adolfo Costa (pr3881@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 Differentiation, our school will focus on the evidence based strategy of Differentiated Instruction. Data-driven differentiated instruction will meet our students' needs and will assist in accelerating learning and closing learning gaps. Data-driven instruction will be monitored through conversations, during common planning, using student data to drive instructional planning to ensure that students' differences in learning capabilities are addressed, and plans are in place to guarantee effective student learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

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.

09-20-2023 Teachers will analyze data using FAST PM1 to determine student individual academic needs. As a result, students will be grouped according to their academic need during teacher led differentiated instruction time.

Person Responsible: Christina Gil (cctgil@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09-20-2023

08-14-23 - 09-29-2023 Tier 2 and Tier 3 students to participate in the Horizon Discovery Intervention Program. As a result, students will be enrolled in intervention programs and will increase their results in Diagnostic 2.

Person Responsible: Christina Gil (cctgil@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08-14-23 - 09-29-2023

08-14-23 - 09-29-2023 Tier 2 and Tier 3 students will be provided extended learning opportunities through before and/or afterschool tutoring. As a result, students will be enrolled in intervention programs and will increase their results in Diagnostic 2.

Person Responsible: Christina Gil (cctgil@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08-14-23 - 09-29-2023

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

According to the 2023 data reviewed in grade 2, the FAST PM3 ELA- In the three areas assessed, Reading Across Genres & Vocabulary showed the lowest performance with 55% of students scoring below proficiency, with none of the standards tested being above proficiency. Context and Connotation and Interpreting Figurative Language were the lowest performing standard group where the students scored below the proficiency standards although the performance was similar to the test as whole. Based on this data, our school will implement Academic Vocabulary as an area of focus.

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

When comparing the FAST PM3 Third Grade Results to the state average, the state's proficiency is at 50% and the school's proficiency is at 39%. The most significant difference in the reporting categories is in Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary. The school scored at 13% proficient and the state average score was 30% proficient. Based on this data, our school will implement Academic Vocabulary Instruction as an area of focus.

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

In 2nd Grade, 55% of students scored below a Level 3 on the 2023 FAST PM3 ELA Assessment. With the implementation of Academic Vocabulary, students will show a minimum increase of 3 percentage points when comparing the progress in FAST ELA from PM1 to PM3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In 3rd Grade, 57% of students scored below a Level 3 on the 2023 FAST PM3 ELA Assessment. With the implementation of Academic Vocabulary, students will show a minimum increase of 3 percentage points when comparing the progress in FAST ELA from PM1 to PM3.

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.

The leadership team will review FAST data and Performance Matters student data and conduct data chats with the teachers. Follow-up will consist of regular walkthroughs to ensure that data-driven standards-based differentiated instruction is taking place. Data analysis will take place to ensure that students are demonstrating growth. Students will be provided with extended learning opportunities to include before/after school tutoring, interventions, and pull-out services

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Costa, Adolfo, pr3881@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?

Our school will focus on the evidenced based strategy of Academic Vocabulary. Academic vocabulary instruction will meet our students’ needs with vocabulary as assessed by ELA FAST. Academic vocabulary instruction will be monitored through formal and informal observations, during common planning, and by using student data to assess progress in the area of vocabulary.

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?

Academic Vocabulary Instruction plays a critical role in improving vocabulary skills for all learners. Academic Vocabulary should be incorporated through effective lessons in a myriad of ways including the use of interactive journals, interactive word walls, exposure to diverse texts, visual stimuli, incorporation into daily dialogue, etc., and associated with the content being taught.

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
08-14-23 - 08-29-2023 Teachers will analyze data using FAST PM1 to determine student individual academic needs. As a result, students will be grouped according to their academic need during teacher led differentiated instruction time.	Costa, Adolfo, pr3881@dadeschools.net
08-14-23 thru 08-29-2023 Tier 2 and Tier 3 students to participate in the Horizon Discovery Intervention Program. As a result, students will be enrolled in intervention programs and will increase their results in Diagnostic 2.	Rivero-Setien, Suzanne, sriverosetien@dadeschools.net