

International Studies Charter Middle School



Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
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

International Studies Charter Middle School

2480 SW 8TH ST, Miami, FL 33135

<http://ischs.dadeschools.net>

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.

International Studies Charter School was established to serve the needs of the community by offering a multi-lingual, multi-literate, and multi-cultural curriculum, preparing students to be thoughtful, educated members of a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

International Studies Charter School teaches students to think and behave as citizens of the world, make decisions with integrity, and graduate with a sense of purpose.

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
Lopez, Alina	Principal	<p>Oversee day-to-day school operations</p> <p>Manage school logistics and budgets</p> <p>Set learning goals for students and teachers based on national curricula</p> <p>Monitor and report on teacher performance</p> <p>Present data from school performance to board members</p> <p>Research new resources and techniques to improve teaching</p> <p>Interview and hire school personnel</p> <p>Review and implement school policies</p> <p>Provide guidance and counseling to teachers</p> <p>Handle emergencies and school crises</p> <p>Organize school events and assemblies</p> <p>Ensure a safe and clean environment for students (e.g. implementing hygiene rules)</p> <p>Attend conferences to gain knowledge on current educational trends</p>
Quintana, Veronica	Assistant Principal	<p>Assist to Oversee day-to-day school operations</p> <p>Assist to Set learning goals for students and teachers based on national curricula</p> <p>Assist to Monitor and report on teacher performance</p> <p>Assist to Research new resources and techniques to improve teaching</p> <p>Assist to Interview and hire school personnel</p> <p>Assist to Review and implement school policies</p> <p>Assist to Provide guidance and counseling to teachers</p> <p>Assist to Handle emergencies and school crises</p> <p>Assist to Organize school events and assemblies</p> <p>Assist to Ensure a safe and clean environment for students (e.g. implementing hygiene rules)</p> <p>Assist to Attend conferences to gain knowledge on current educational trends</p>
Davalos, Javier		<p>Serves as a member of the leadership team and oversees curriculum development and pedagogical practices that result in interpersonal connections, culturally relevant learning experiences, and equity and access to high quality instruction for all students.</p>
cobo, jose	Teacher, K-12	<p>Serves as a member of the leadership team and oversees curriculum development and pedagogical practices that result in interpersonal connections, culturally relevant learning experiences, and equity and access to high quality instruction for all students.</p>
Santiago, Joaquin	Teacher, K-12	<p>Serves as a member of the leadership team and oversees curriculum development and</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		pedagogical practices that result in interpersonal connections, culturally relevant learning experiences, and equity and access to high quality instruction for all students.
Taks, David	Teacher, K-12	Serves as a member of the leadership team and oversees curriculum development and pedagogical practices that result in interpersonal connections, culturally relevant learning experiences, and equity and access to high quality instruction for all students.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The school establishes an EESAC, comprising representatives from various stakeholder groups, including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students, families, and potentially business or community leaders. This council serves as the core body responsible for developing and guiding the SIP. The school communicates the SIP development process and its importance to all stakeholders through various means. This ensures that everyone is aware of the opportunity to participate. The EESAC reviews the input gathered from various stakeholders and identifies common themes, priorities, and concerns. This analysis helps to determine the most critical areas that need to be addressed in the SIP. Building on the input received, the EESAC develops specific and measurable goals for the SIP. The EESAC drafts the SIP, detailing the goals, objectives, action steps, responsible parties, timelines, and assessment methods. The EESAC drafts the SIP, detailing the goals, objectives, action steps, responsible parties, timelines, and assessment methods.

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 collects various quantitative data, including standardized test scores, classroom assessments, attendance rates, graduation rates, and disciplinary incidents. This data is disaggregated by different student groups, including those with the greatest achievement gaps throughout the year during EESAC meetings. The data is reviewed to assess progress toward the SIP goals. Periodic meetings are held by the EESAC to discuss the collected data, review progress, and identify areas that require attention or improvement. Based on the data analysis and stakeholder input, the EESAC and school leadership make informed decisions about the effectiveness of the SIP's strategies and interventions. If data analysis reveals that certain strategies are not yielding the desired outcomes, the EESAC revisits the SIP's action steps related to those strategies. The EESAC follows a continuous improvement cycle, where the plan is regularly reviewed, refined, and adjusted based on evidence and

feedback. At the end of each academic year, the EESAC conducts a comprehensive evaluation of the SIP's impact on student achievement and the reduction of the achievement gap.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	77%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	61%
Charter School	Yes
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)	English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

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

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	85	56	49	85	55	50	83		
ELA Learning Gains				68			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				73			66		
Math Achievement*	89	60	56	88	43	36	84		
Math Learning Gains				79			52		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				85			58		
Science Achievement*	82	55	49	64	54	53	70		
Social Studies Achievement*	96	72	68	95	64	58	82		
Middle School Acceleration	86	74	73	69	56	49	72		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					73	70			
ELP Progress	83	50	40		77	76	100		

* 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	87
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	521
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	706
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL	75			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	87			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	87			
FRL	87			

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	73			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	78			

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	78			

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	85			89			82	96	86			83
SWD												
ELL	68			80			61	94	65		6	83
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	84			90			82	97	86		6	83
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	89			84			84	91	86		5	
FRL	82			90			81	96	87		5	

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	85	68	73	88	79	85	64	95	69			
SWD												
ELL	71	61	68	81	84	90	42	89	67			
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK												
HSP	83	69	74	88	80	89	64	93	66			
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	91	61	67	88	72	75	59	100	76			
FRL	82	65	72	88	83	88	59	94	74			

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	83	65	66	84	52	58	70	82	72			100
SWD												
ELL	74	68	68	78	55	61	53	82	57			100
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	83	64	65	84	53	57	71	82	72			
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	78	66	67	83	50	64	68	79	73			
FRL	84	67	71	83	49	56	70	79	72			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	86%	50%	36%	47%	39%
08	2023 - Spring	78%	51%	27%	47%	31%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	74%	50%	24%	47%	27%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	78%	58%	20%	54%	24%
07	2023 - Spring	88%	48%	40%	48%	40%
08	2023 - Spring	95%	59%	36%	55%	40%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	73%	40%	33%	44%	29%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	56%	37%	50%	43%

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

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	65%	33%	63%	35%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	68%	24%	66%	26%

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.

6th grade ELA showed the lowest performance. Contributing factors included language proficiency of students and increase in ELL students. New State assessment and teachers aligning standards and instruction. 6th graders are new to the school and there is an adjustment period.

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

8th grade ELA showed the greatest decline within the same cohort. Contributing factors included language proficiency of students and increase in ELL students. New State assessment and teachers aligning standards and instruction. 6th graders are new to the school and there is an adjustment period.

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.

NA

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

The 8th grade Science component showed the most improvement in the 22-23 school year. The teacher was one of the contributing factors to the increase. Professional Development and content knowledge all played a role.

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

ELL students still show a lower proficiency rate on ELA and Math.

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

Continue to improve on proficiency for ELA, especially our ELL population. Work on gains for the upcoming school year and address the writing component which will be new this upcoming 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 Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

Creating a positive school culture and environment is crucial for the success of all students, particularly for those in low-performing subgroups. The 21-22 school year was a transitional year and much change was experienced and it affected the culture and environment. Addressing teacher retention and recruitment was crucial and we saw great gains in the 22-23 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We saw gains in many of the areas in which we identified a need to recruit and retain teachers. We also saw the culture of the school change for the better.

Monitoring:

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

Attendance Records, climate surveys of all stakeholders and school data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alina Lopez (alina_lopez@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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The decision to prioritize "Instructional Practice Relating to Instructional Coaching and Professional Learning" as a key area of focus is firmly grounded in a comprehensive analysis of various data sources, underscoring the compelling need to enhance teaching practices and improve student learning outcomes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school's objective is to realize a minimum 5% increase in student proficiency rates in benchmark-aligned subjects as measured by state standardized assessments within the current academic year.

Monitoring:

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

Data baseline collection, professional lesson planning, and coaching and professional development

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Veronica Quintana (vquintana@ischs.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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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).

The school leadership, with input from the EESAC, develops a budget that outlines how the available funding will be allocated to support the interventions and activities identified in the SIP. The budget is reviewed by the EESAC and school leadership to ensure alignment with the SIP goals and the identified needs.