Pinecrest Glades Preparatory Academy Middle High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Pinecrest Glades Preparatory Academy Middle High School

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 Middle High 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 Middle High 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 Middle-High 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.
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.
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
Benigno-Lantz, Arlene	School Counselor	Serves as a liaison between the families and the school to continuously support the student's social, emotional, mental, and educational needs.
Shore, Cynthia	School Counselor	Serves as a liaison between the families and the school to continuously support the student's social, emotional, mental, and educational needs.
Chaine, Andriana	ELL Compliance Specialist	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.
Minera, Corina	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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		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.

After a careful review of the 2022-2023 data and the changes in testing for the 2023-2024 school year, the Curriculum Council agreed that the SIP goals should include a school-wide writing goal, a goal to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency on the statewide sciece assessment, and a school climate and culture goal related to teacher recruitment and retention. These goals will be presented to the EESAC Committee at the September meeting to all stakeholder groups (teachers/parents/students/community business partners).

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 leadership team will be monitor the progress towards these goals throughout the school year. For the writing goal, the ELA department will administer writing assessments throughout the year to monitor progress. Our science proficiency goal data will be monitored form district-provided assessments (mid-year assessments/topic tests), as well as classroom summative assessments.

We have these goals as agenda items every month on our curriculum council meetings, department meetings, and EESAC meetings and to ensure these goals remain a top priority. We will discuss our progress towards these goals and make shifts in our strategies when needed.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	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) Asian Students (ASN) 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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	19	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	13	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	6	14	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	45	70	156
	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	20	32	64

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	10	15	6	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	1	14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	20	19	82
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	15	17	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	66	67	191

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	12	22	21	62

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	1	0	0	1
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	10	15	6	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	1	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	20	19	46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	15	17	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	66	67	191

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	12	22	21	55

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	1	0	0	1
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*	71	55	50	73	54	51	70		
ELA Learning Gains				68			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			51		
Math Achievement*	71	43	38	68	42	38	52		
Math Learning Gains				74			27		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			23		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	62	62	64	56	41	40	47		
Social Studies Achievement*	91	69	66	91	56	48	58		
Middle School Acceleration	68			76	56	44	58		
Graduation Rate	100	89	89	100	56	61			
College and Career Acceleration	93	70	65	100	67	67			
ELP Progress	75	49	45	92			71		

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	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	631
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	918
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	100

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	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	79			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	77			

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	57			
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK				
HSP	76			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	74			

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	71			71			62	91	68	100	93	75
SWD	45			43			42	65			4	
ELL	56			55			36	87	53		6	75
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	71			72			62	91	67	92	8	75
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	69			67							2	
FRL	67			69			58	90	61	92	8	75

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	73	68	53	68	74	67	56	91	76	100	100	92
SWD	39	62	57	48	63	71	40	78				
ELL	58	62	49	61	71	59	30	85				92
AMI												
ASN	80	90										
BLK												
HSP	73	68	53	68	74	66	57	91	75	100	100	92
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	76	65		62	77							
FRL	71	64	55	64	72	69	52	87	67	100	100	90

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	70	60	51	52	27	23	47	58	58			71
SWD	47	43	40	30	31	33						
ELL	56	64	58	40	24	24	31	39	47			71

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	70	61	51	52	27	24	48	58	59			71
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	60	29		33	14							
FRL	65	59	47	45	26	23	44	42	49			73

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	74%	54%	20%	50%	24%
07	2023 - Spring	68%	50%	18%	47%	21%
08	2023 - Spring	65%	51%	14%	47%	18%
09	2023 - Spring	64%	51%	13%	48%	16%
06	2023 - Spring	76%	50%	26%	47%	29%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	75%	58%	17%	54%	21%
07	2023 - Spring	62%	48%	14%	48%	14%
08	2023 - Spring	84%	59%	25%	55%	29%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	45%	40%	5%	44%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	56%	21%	50%	27%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	52%	12%	48%	16%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	79%	65%	14%	63%	16%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	68%	26%	66%	28%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	79%	66%	13%	63%	16%

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.

Based on the data available from the 2022-2023 assessments, the lowest component was the statewide science assessment with 48% of students achieving proficiency. The trend data indicates that the

science assessment data has been less than 50% for the past three years.

The science standards assessed are taught over a period of three years in middle school through the comprehensive science courses. Students often struggle to recall and apply key concepts and information from the previous comprehensive science courses. In addition, there has not been consistency in instructional staff teaching these courses.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was the percentage of students achieving proficiency on the 9th grade ELA assessment. In 2022-2023, 64% percent of 9th grade students achieved proficiency compared to 2021-2022 when 76% of 9th grade students achieved proficiency.

Several factors may have contributed to the decline in the 9th-grade English Language Arts (ELA) proficiency rate. When new state standards are introduced, teachers need time and training to become familiar with the new standards. The transition period might result in a temporary decline in proficiency rates as educators adjust their curriculum, teaching methods, and resources to align with the new standards.

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.

Based on the results of the 2022-2023 statewide assessments, there are no data components that are lower than the state average. All components exceeded the state average.

On the grade 6, 7, and 8 ELA assessment, the state average was 47% and our students achieved 76%, 68%, and 65% respectively. On the 9th grade ELA assessment, the state average was 48% and our students achieved 64%. On the 10th grade ELA assessment, the state average was 50% and our students achieved a 74%.

We saw similar results on the math and science assessments. On the grade 6, 7, and 8 Mathematics assessment, the state averages were, 54%, 48%, 55% and our students achieved 75%, 62%, and 84% respectively. On the Algebra 1 EOC, the state average was 50% and our students achieved 77%. On the Geometry EOC, the state average was 48% and our students achieved a 64%. The state average on the Statewide Science Assessment (Grade 8) was 44% and our students achieved a 48% proficiency rate. On the Biology EOC the state average was a 63% and our students achieved a proficiency rate of 79%.

The state average on the Civics EOC (Grade 7) was 66% and our students achieved a 94% proficiency rate. On the US History EOC the state average was a 63% and our students achieved a proficiency rate of 79%.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the percentage of students achieving proficiency on the pre-algebra assessment. In 2022-2023, 84% percent of pre-algebra students achieved proficiency compared to 2021-2022 when 42% of 8th grade students achieved proficiency.

Careful monitoring of the data, effective interventions with certified teachers, after school and Saturday tutoring, and the use of differentiated instruction in all classes contributed to the improvement in this component. In addition, Professional Learning Communities before and after school, Professional Trainings/Meetings with teachers for collaboration, collecting and analyzing data from Progress Monitoring Assessments in order to plan intervention strategies for low performing students.

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

After careful review of the EWS data from Part 1, the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency in grades 6-8 is an area of concern. We will continue to incorporate instructional strategies and school-wide initiatives that focus on the learning gains for the lowest 25% in ELA.

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

1. School-wide B.E.S.T. Writing Assessment Proficiency Rate
2. Statewide Science Assessment Proficiency Rate
3. ELA proficiency rate for the lowest 25%

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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 trend of the Statewide Science Assessment data from the past three years, 48% of students achieved proficiency in 2023. In 2022, 41% of students and in 2021, 22% of students earned proficiency on the Statewide Science Assessment.

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

Our goal is to increase the proficiency level by 5% on the 2024 Science State Assessment bringing the proficiency level above 50%.

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

Teachers will administer the district provided baseline, mid-year, and topic assessments to continuously monitor student progress towards proficiency. School leadership team, department chair, and classroom teachers will meet quarterly to review the available data and adjust strategies as necessary.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Kairalla (jenniferkairalla@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.)

Teachers design and facilitate inquiry-based activities that encourage students to ask questions, design experiments, gather data, analyze results, and draw conclusions. These activities align with the curriculum and allow students to explore scientific concepts in a practical and meaningful way.

All science teachers will receive training in inquiry-based teaching methodologies. This professional development equips them with the skills to design and implement effective hands-on activities, facilitate discussions, and support students' exploration of scientific concepts.

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

As students engage in active exploration and critical thinking, their understanding of scientific concepts deepens, leading to improved performance on the statewide science assessment.

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.

Provide professional development for all science teachers on inquiry-based teaching strategies, including designing effective hands-on activities, guiding student investigations, and promoting critical thinking.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Kairalla (jenniferkairalla@dadeschools.net)

By When: By the end of September 2023.

#2. 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 1000 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 then implement.

New teachers often face challenges and uncertainties in their early years of teaching. The PGA mentor program can provide the support necessary to overcome these challenges, leading to increased job satisfaction and a higher likelihood of retaining the newly hired teachers. The lead teacher will monitor the PGA mentor program and will provide additional support if issues arise, helping to prevent potential burnout or attrition.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Zuleika Santos (zsantos@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 curriculum council 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 with an anonymous platform to indicate their feedback on areas such as resources, support systems, leadership, relationships, areas of concern, and challenges. The curriculum council is made of department leaders who can provide the specific perspective from the

department level on the areas where teachers need additional support and/or resources. Many of the department leaders also serve as teacher mentors for the rookie teachers.

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.

1. The School Climate Survey will be provided to all teachers and reviewed upon completion.

2. Participate in a local college/job fair to recruit potential staff members

Person Responsible: Zuleika Santos (zsantos@dadeschools.net)

By When: June 2024

#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 6-10. 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, included as a component of the overall ELA score, showed that only 73% of students in grades 6-10 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 76% of our students in grades 6-10 score a level 3 or above on the FAST-Writing component.

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

Teachers will attend trainings and professional development to comprehend the BEST Standards and writing 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 assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tommy Espinoza (tespinoza@pinecrestglades.com)

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 subject areas, not just in the ELA department, a schoolwide writing plan will be implemented. Students in grades 6-10 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 in an efficient manner.

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

A school-wide writing plan ensures that writing instruction is consistent and aligned across all grade levels and subject areas. When students receive a unified approach to writing instruction, they can build upon their skills from year to year, resulting in a coherent and progressive development of writing abilities.

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.

Provide professional development sessions for teachers to familiarize them with the school-wide writing plan, instructional strategies, and the B.E.S.T. Writing rubrics.

Person Responsible: Tommy Espinoza (tespinoza@pinecrestglades.com)

By When: Initial PD during teacher orientation week and ongoing PDs throughout the year during faculty and department meetings.