Pinecrest Glades Academy School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Pinecrest Glades Academy

15250 SW EIGHTH ST, Miami, FL 33194

www.pinecrestglades.org

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 core philosophy and vision of Pinecrest Glades Academy is reflected in a learning environment, which allows students to learn and progress at their individual pace. Our vision encompasses setting high standards and supporting students through the process of achieving these standards to foster an environment of success. Pinecrest Glades Academy teachers adapt their instructional strategies to meet the individual styles of each student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Pinecrest Glades Academy is to empower lifelong learners with knowledge and values required for productive global leadership.

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
Dopico, Susie	Principal	The Principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making. The Principal ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS, intervention and documentation, and adequate professional development to support school improvement initiatives. The Principal oversees the administration of RtI skills of school staff, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.
Nario, Vanessa	Assistant Principal	Assist in all school operations and safety at Pinecrest Glades Academy
Quintero, Barbara	Assistant Principal	Assist in all school operations and safety at Pinecrest Glades Academy
Espinoza, Tommy	Assistant Principal	Assist in all school operations and safety at Pinecrest Glades Academy
Kairalla, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Assist in all school operations and safety at Pinecrest Glades Academy
Santos, Zuleika	Assistant Principal	Assist in all school operations and safety at Pinecrest Glades Academy
Millan, Amanda	School Counselor	Serves as a liaison between the families and the school to continuously support the student's social, emotional, mental, and educational needs.
Duran, Dania	Instructional Coach	Collects and analyzes data from Interim Assessments in order to plan intervention strategies for low performing students. Provides, designs, and participates in professional development opportunities in accordance with specific needs.
Espinoza , Christina	Teacher, ESE	SPED Specialist: Works in partnership with the general education teachers and provides teachers with intervention strategies and materials. Attends meetings and relays pertinent information to the MTSS Leadership Team. Collects and analyzes data from Interim Assessments in order to plan intervention strategies for low performing students. Provides, designs, and participates in professional development opportunities in accordance with specific needs.
Betancourt, Susie	ELL Compliance Specialist	Works with the school administration and teachers to ensure the ESOL programs and services are coordinated in the school and are administered uniformly and equitably.
Flores, Suzette	Instructional Coach	Collects and analyzes data from Interim Assessments in order to plan intervention strategies for low performing students. Provides, designs, and participates in professional development opportunities in accordance with specific needs.

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.

Stakeholder input is provided through regularly scheduled School Advisory Council (EESAC) meetings and school climate surveys for students, parents and staff. School data is reviewed by all stakeholders at the beginning of the year, mid-year and end of year to determine areas of focus and monitor progress. A culminating review of the school's progress at the last EESAC meeting of the year (with all stakeholders represented) provides discussion of preliminary goals for upcoming school year.

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 Improvement Plan will be monitored through multiple assessments including: FAST PM2, FAST PM3, i-Ready AP2 and AP3. Monitoring State academic standards will be done through FAST PM2 and FAST PM3. The plan will be reviewed by all stakeholders at the EESAC meeting following each assessment and revised as necessary.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	98%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	54%
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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	1	24	28	12	2	5	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	5	13	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	14	19	9	13	0	0	0	60

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	1	0	0	5	2	7	0	0	0	15

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	1	2	1	4	9	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	1	6	5	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	14	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	0	11	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	22	25	8	43	0	0	0	104

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	1	1	10	2	11	7	0	0	0	32

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	1	2	1	4	9	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	1	6	5	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	14	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	0	11	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	22	25	8	43	0	0	0	104

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	1	1	10	2	11	7	0	0	0	32

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
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*	79	60	53	83	62	56	64		
ELA Learning Gains				85			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				70			38		
Math Achievement*	83	66	59	86	58	50	53		
Math Learning Gains				93			24		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				89			14		
Science Achievement*	73	58	54	74	64	59	36		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration					80				
ELP Progress	67	63	59	70			65		

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	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	389
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	81
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	650
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	49			
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN	95			
BLK				
HSP	78			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	85			

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	75			

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	58			
ELL	74			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	82			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
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	79			83			73					67
SWD	36			48			62				3	
ELL	69			74			61				5	67
AMI												
ASN	100			90							2	
BLK												
HSP	79			83			73				5	67
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	80			90							2	
FRL	75			79			71				5	67

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	85	70	86	93	89	74					70
SWD	45	56	45	62	80							
ELL	69	78	65	77	92	87	50					70
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	83	85	71	86	93	90	74					70
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	78	82	67	82	91	85	71					68

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	64	54	38	53	24	14	36					65
SWD	29	40		19	20		30					
ELL	49	47	30	40	19	8	23					65
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	64	54	39	52	25	14	37					65
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	60	51	21	47	20	8	36					71

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
05	2023 - Spring	76%	56%	20%	54%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	58%	21%	58%	21%
03	2023 - Spring	82%	52%	30%	50%	32%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	93%	63%	30%	59%	34%
04	2023 - Spring	84%	64%	20%	61%	23%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	58%	17%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	70%	50%	20%	51%	19%

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.

Grade 5 Science showed the lowest performance with 70% proficiency. The students entering fifth grade had two years of virtual learning with minimal attendance for brick and mortar schooling. It directly impacted their learning in all areas, especially reading and the science concepts covered in grades 2 and 3. Hands-on experimentation and in-class labs were sacrificed, and the students' mastery of grade-level skills was lacking as a result. The change to a "wheel" format for the 2022-2023 school year provided students with one hour in each content area before changing to another teacher/classroom for another subject area content delivery. The students struggled with the fast-paced curriculum delivery and higher levels of self-regulation and accountability required to learn all the material covered. The new format did not provide sufficient in-class time to remediate students on grade level concepts or reteach concepts

from the virtual education years. Additionally, the students' deficiencies in reading comprehension further impacted their ability to fully learn the science concepts.

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

Grade 5 ELA showed the greatest decline from 87% proficiency to 76% proficiency. The rotation of five classes each for one hour ("wheel") made intervention and small group instruction difficult to implement to target specific student needs. Additionally, a large portion of the 5th grade class began the year at least one grade level below in reading. These students also struggled with reading components such as vocabulary.

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.

All data components, regardless of grade level or subject tested, surpassed the state average for proficiency. For ELA proficiency, state averages were 50%, 58%, and 54% for grades 3,4,5 respectively. Our ELA proficiency for grades 3, 4, and 5 was 84%, 79%, and 76%, respectively. For Math proficiency, state averages were 59%, 61%, and 55% for grades 3, 4, and 5 respectively. Our Math proficiency for grades 3, 4, and 5 was 93%, 84%, and 75%, respectively. For Grade 5 Science, the state average was 51% and our proficiency was 70%. Factors contributing to this success include high caliber instructional delivery, differentiated classroom instruction, afterschool and Saturday tutoring sessions, and targeted interventions for struggling students.

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

Math grade 4 and grade 3 both increased by 3 percentage points with grade 3 achieving 93% proficiency and 4th grade with 79% proficiency. Teachers applied the BEST standards effectively and checked for mastery of standards using i-Ready data to create small groups and interventions. Teachers had monthly data chats with students to discuss improvements and set/revise goals. Teacher integrated resources such as IXL lessons that correlated with the standards and daily lessons. Teachers monitored for progress and met often with parents and students to collaborate and provide academic and social emotional support to all students.

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

After reviewing the Early Warning Sign data, one area of concern is the number of students with 10% or more absences in grades 1, 2 and 3. A second area of concern is the retention rate in third grade.

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

1. Implement schoolwide writing plan that includes grades K-5
2. Target the third grade retention rate
3. Improve student attendance in grades K-2

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.

Heading into the 2023-2024 school year, the Florida Education Association reported approximately 7,000 teaching vacancies. an increase of 1,000 vacancies from the year prior. The FLDOE has listed the following subject areas a critical teacher shortage areas for 2023-2024:
• Exceptional Student Education (ESE)
• English
• Science-General
• English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)
• Reading
• Math
Given the status of teacher shortages in Florida, providing a positive culture and environment related to recruitment and retention of teachers is essential to continue providing high caliber educational services to our students.

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

In order to ensure the continuity of high caliber educational services for students, our goal is to participate in at least one local teacher recruitment event and maintain a 90% or higher teacher retention rate.

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

School Leadership Team will ensure our school participates in recruitment events at local colleges. An ongoing mentorship program for first-year teachers is in place and will continue to be implemented. The school climate survey results for the prior school year will be studied to determine areas where teacher satisfaction and support can be increased. Grade level chairpersons will monitor their assigned departments to identify areas for improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Barbara Quintero (955274@dadeschools.net)

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

The school climate survey and grade level meeting minutes will be used to monitor progress and areas for improvement.

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

The school climate survey provides teachers an anonymous platform to indicate their feedback on areas such as resources, support systems, leadership, relationships, areas of concern, and challenges. Grade level meeting minutes provide the specific perspective from the grade level on the areas where teachers need additional support and/or resources on a monthly basis.

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.

The Lead Teacher will monitor the grade level meetings and collect the recommendations from grade levels to share with the School Leadership Team. The School Climate Survey link will be provided to all teachers and reviewed upon completion.

Person Responsible: Barbara Quintero (955274@dadeschools.net)

By When:

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

Third grade retention has been identified as a critical need from the data reviewed as 53% of current third graders scored below proficiency on the Grade 2 FAST - STAR exam.

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

In order to address the needs of our current third grade students, our goal is to have 80% of our students score at Level 3 or higher on the FAST ELA exam.

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

Interventionists will follow a schedule that will focus on those students identified as being in the lowest 25th percentile based on the i-Ready AP1 Diagnostic. The Instructional Coach for Reading will meet with teachers and interventionists for planning, to provide feedback and support, and use resources for differentiating instruction, improvements on instruction and group learning activities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzette Flores (sflores@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.)

Instructional Coach for Reading, interventionists and the leadership team will monitor student progress using i-Ready reports and class assessments.

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

The 2022-2023 end of year state assessment results show a large percentage of incoming third graders did not achieve proficiency in Grade 2 ELA.

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.

Assistant Principals will monitor the implementation and fidelity of interventions provided by interventionists and classroom teachers. Intervention logs and student achievement using i-Ready AP2 and AP3 as well as FAST PM2 and PM3 will be reviewed on an ongoing basis.

Person Responsible: Vanessa Nario (vnario@pinecrestglades.com)

By When:

#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.

For 2023-2024, a computer-based (CBT) Writing Assessment, aligned with the BEST Standards, will be administered to all students in grades 4 and 5. This assessment will have a measure of proficiency independent of the ELA proficiency score for each student. The 2022 FSA Writing Assessment, which was paper-based and included as a component of the overall ELA score, showed that only 67% of the grade 4 students tested achieved proficiency on this component. Given the shift from the FSA to the BEST Standards rubric, paired with the writing exam being CBT as well as a standalone category for proficiency makes it a crucial area of need.

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

Our goal is to have 75% of our students in both 4th and 5th grade score at a proficiency level or above on the FAST Writing Assessment.

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

Teachers and our Instructional Coach for Reading will attend trainings and professional development to comprehend the BEST Standards and rubric and how to apply them in the classroom. Teachers will work with students in small groups to hone their writing skills. Instructional Coaches and the administrative team will monitor student progress using grade level and class assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Barbara Quintero (955274@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.)

In order to establish a methodology to incorporate writing across all grade levels, not only the grade levels being tested, a schoolwide writing plan for grades K-5 will be implemented. The plan will define the components of writing that students completing each grade level are to have achieved. Students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will have access to computers on a daily basis to assist them with learning how to answer writing prompts by typing and editing their responses directly on the screen.

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

As per the last state writing assessment, the evidence shows a need to address proficiency rate in writing. At the time the test was paper-based. Moving to a computer-based tests requires additional support to address student practice and training in computer-based writing.

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.

Assistant Principals will monitor the implementation and fidelity of the schoolwide writing plan across all grade levels. The BEST Standards writing rubric will be provided to teachers in grades 4 and 5 to incorporate into classroom writing activities. Student achievement and data will be reviewed on an ongoing basis.

Person Responsible: Barbara Quintero (955274@dadeschools.net)

By When: