

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Downtown Doral Charter Elementary School



2023-24

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	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Downtown Doral Charter Elementary School

8390 NW 53RD ST, Doral, FL 33166

www.ddces.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.

Downtown Doral Charter Elementary School's mission is to provide our students with a comprehensive dual curriculum and bicultural/bilingual education through language acquisition and innovative programs, facilitated by a highly qualified staff promoting students' academic excellence creating future world leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Downtown Doral Charter Elementary School is Innovative Leaders Nurturing Passionate Global Leaders.

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
Acevedo-Isenberg, Jeannette	Head of Schools	The Head of Schools provides a common vision and plan for the use of data- driven decision making and strategic planning.
Ayo, Stefanie		Works alongside the Head of Schools in providing a common vision and plan, for the use of data-driven decision making and strategic planning. The principal provides professional development and resources to support the dual language program and instructional programs.
Valmana, Paloma		Works alongside the principal in providing a common vision and plan for the use of data-driven decision making and strategic planning. The assistant principal provides professional development and resources to support the dual language program and instructional programs.
Castro, Jacqueline	Lead Teacher	Lead Teacher: Provides ELA, Math, and Science support for teachers in third through fifth grade.
Alarcon, Elizabeth		Instructional Coach: Provides ELA and Math support for teachers in kindergarten through second grade.
Gonzalez, Becky		Participates in curriculum planning for core instruction; plans and collaborates with administration in identifying Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students and monitoring progress.
De La Rosa, Annette		Participates in curriculum planning for core instruction; plans and collaborates with administration in identifying Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students and monitoring progress.
Soza, Nathalie		Participates in curriculum planning for core instruction; plans and collaborates with administration in identifying Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students and monitoring progress.
Viera, Alexandra		Participates in curriculum planning for core instruction; plans and collaborates with administration in identifying Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students and monitoring progress.
Suarez, Vanessa		Participates in curriculum planning for core instruction; plans and collaborates with administration in identifying Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students and monitoring progress.
Jimenez, Karla		Participates in curriculum planning for core instruction; plans and collaborates with administration in identifying Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students and monitoring progress.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Monteagudo, Ileana		Provides guidance and expertise in the delivery of the Spanish language program and language standards.
Laks, Ana		Provides guidance and expertise in the delivery of the Portuguese language program and language standards.
Mercado, Ana		Provides guidance and support for all students, teachers, and stakeholders in the school community and ensures the well being of all members.
Ocampo, Rebecca	STEAM Coordinator	Oversees the STEAM component in our program. Ensures that all teachers successfully implement the STEAM component into their daily classroom routines.

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.

On a monthly basis, we conduct our EESAC meetings in which all selected stakeholders attend and we speak and discuss about our School Improvement Plan and what actions are going to be taken in order to ensure that we achieve our goals stated in our yearly SIP.

SIP Monitoring

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

As a team, we revisit our SIP on a monthly basis to ensure that we are tracking the progress of its validity. Based on student data on state assessments, we will regenerate our intervention groups to ensure that we minimize learning gaps for specified students.

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	94%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	41%

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) 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	14	6	4	3	4	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	1	2	8	5	6	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	9	15	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	10	18	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	3	16	14	18	0	0	0	52

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	1	4	10	5	9	0	0	0	29

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	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	14	6	4	3	4	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	2	8	5	6	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	9	15	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	10	18	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	3	16	14	18	0	0	0	52

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	1	4	10	5	9	0	0	0	29

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	14	6	4	3	4	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	1	2	8	5	6	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	9	15	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	10	18	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	3	16	14	18	0	0	0	52

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	1	4	10	5	9	0	0	0	29

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	74	60	53	77	62	56	81		
ELA Learning Gains				71			83		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			78		
Math Achievement*	72	66	59	73	58	50	73		
Math Learning Gains				67			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			40		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	71	58	54	72	64	59	78		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	59	63	59	67			53		

* 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	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	350
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	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	533
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	39	Yes	1	
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	70			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	65			

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	55			
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	66			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	63			

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	74			72			71					59
SWD	30			48			50				4	27
ELL	64			66			57				5	59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	74			72			72				5	58
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	71			68							3	
FRL	66			62			67				5	61

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	77	71	54	73	67	52	72					67
SWD	43	53		52	65	60						55
ELL	65	64	47	66	60	47	60					67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	78	71	55	72	66	51	70					67
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	79	67		78	83		82					
FRL	72	64	54	66	65	48	68					64

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	81	83	78	73	54	40	78					53
SWD	53			32								
ELL	73	80	77	70	53	48	74					53

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	75			83								
BLK												
HSP	81	82	76	73	53	40	77					52
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	83	82		63	73		100					
FRL	73	86	82	63	49	35	69					45

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	75%	56%	19%	54%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	58%	21%	58%	21%
03	2023 - Spring	71%	52%	19%	50%	21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	80%	63%	17%	59%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	64%	14%	61%	17%
05	2023 - Spring	66%	58%	8%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	71%	50%	21%	51%	20%

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, there was a consistent low proficiency rate for our lowest 25 percentile subgroups in both ELA and Math. Due to the implementation of the new testing platform, we believe that it was a determining factor as to the performance of the students.

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

Based on the data, in the ELA component, our overall achievement level decreased to a 75% from a 77% in grades 3rd-5th. For the Science FCAT administered to 5th graders, our overall achievement level decreased to a 71% from a 72%. Due to the implementation of the new testing platform, we believe that it was a determining factor as to the performance of the students.

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.

2023 Data is not available from the state.

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

Based on the data, the overall achievement level of Math increased to 74% from 73%. As a school, we implemented Math boot camps for all students that scored a level 1 or 2 within the FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments.

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

Based on the data, the area of concern is the number of students that scored a level 1 in ELA and Math on the FAST PM3.

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

Increase proficiency of ELA

Increase proficiency of Math

Increase proficiency of Science for 5th grade

Continuous work with the 25 percentile subgroup

Achieve learning gains for 4th and 5th grade in ELA and Math

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 Differentiation**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on the data review, our school will implement the Targeted Element of Differentiated Instruction. Our findings demonstrated that our proficiency levels for reading and Science decreased. However, with differentiated instruction in place, each student's needs will be met. We will provide the necessary instruction for the lowest 25% subgroup to make learning gains and move towards proficiency levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement differentiated instruction, then our lowest 25% subgroup proficiency levels will increase by a minimum of 10 to 15 percentage points as evidenced by the 2024 state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will conduct quarterly data chats and follow up with weekly walkthroughs to ensure quality instruction and differentiated instruction is taking place. Administrators will review weekly lesson plans for indication of differentiated instruction in designated sections. Teachers will adjust groups based on current data on a monthly basis. Data analysis of i-Ready Growth Monitoring of the lowest 25% subgroup will be reviewed monthly to review progress. Intervention will be provided to those students who are not showing growth on i-Ready. In addition, we will closely monitor the results of the FAST PM1, PM2, and PM3.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paloma Valmana (pvalmana@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Within the targeted element of differentiated instruction, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Data-Driven Instruction. Data-Driven Instruction will assist in accelerating the learning gains of our lowest 25% subgroup. Data-Driven Instruction will be monitored through the use of i-Ready and FAST PM1 and PM2 to drive instructional planning and data driven conversations. We will also implement focused walkthroughs that allow the administrators to carefully ensure that all educational components are being met.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data-Driven Instruction will ensure that teachers are using relevant data to plan individualized lessons. Teachers will continually make adjustments to their instruction as new data becomes available through the student reports from the FAST PM1, PM2, and PM3.

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.

Conduct teacher training on differentiated instruction and data driven instruction.

Person Responsible: Paloma Valmana (pvalmana@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 31, 2023.

Provide training to teachers on using digital platforms and resources to create individualized instructional plans that are aligned to the B.E.S.T. Standards.

Person Responsible: Paloma Valmana (pvalmana@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 31, 2023.

Conduct quarterly data chats.

Person Responsible: Stefanie Ayo (svergara@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 31, 2023.

Based on our data chats, the intervention groups will be regenerated using data from the PM1 STAR or FAST and iReady Diagnostic 1.

Person Responsible: Paloma Valmana (pvalmana@dadeschools.net)

By When: January 31, 2024.

The administrative team will continue to conduct and model DI lessons across all grade levels.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Alarcon (ealarcon@dadeschools.net)

By When: January 31, 2024.

#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.

Based on qualitative data from the 2022-2023 School Climate survey and review of core leadership competencies, we want to use the targeted element of teacher recruitment and retention. Teachers in the building felt overloaded and overwhelmed, therefore we want to align efforts towards creating clear goals and reconnecting the school family. Therefore, the leadership team will obtain resources and people to achieve the goal in support of promoting team morale and enhancing performance. By setting clear goals and providing teacher support, teachers will no longer feel overwhelmed causing long term teacher retention.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement the targeted element of teacher recruitment and retention, our teachers will be provided with the resources needed to achieve their goals and opportunities for team building will be provided on a monthly basis. Teachers will become active stakeholders, build relationships, and invest in the school family culture. The percentage of teachers who frequently feel overloaded and overwhelmed will decrease by 10% during the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The administrative team will create a digital teacher reflection survey that will be sent on a quarterly basis to self assess progress. By analyzing the survey data, strategies will be revised and redirected as needed throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Alarcon (ealarcon@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Within the targeted element of teacher recruitment and retention, we will focus on the evidence based strategy of generating momentum to accomplish school goals by creating a teacher support task force. The task force members will provide a summary of support to the leadership team on a monthly basis to make sure we are on the right track to meeting the outcome above. We will also be conducting more frequent events, such as happy hours, staff recognition at faculty meetings to ensure all staff members always feel highlighted and supported.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Generating momentum to accomplish school goals will assist in aligning teachers in becoming active stakeholders in carrying out the school's mission. Throughout the process, the leadership team will create buy-in and in turn will increase teacher retention.

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.

Informing teachers of the leadership team's goal in engaging the team through aligning efforts towards clear goals and support.

Person Responsible: Stefanie Ayo (svergara@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 31, 2023.

Conducting quarterly teacher reflection surveys.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Alarcon (ealarcon@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 31, 2023.

Administration is providing opportunities for staff members to visit and observe other teachers in the classrooms. Administrators are also visiting the classes in order to conduct model lessons for the teachers.

Person Responsible: Paloma Valmana (pvalmana@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 31, 2023.

Administration is attending grade level meetings on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Castro (nodaj@dadeschools.net)

By When: January 31, 2024.

The administrative team will review the responses from the Quarterly Teacher Reflection Surveys and will alter areas of improvement accordingly to ensure that any feedback given was implemented effectively.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Alarcon (ealarcon@dadeschools.net)

By When: January 31, 2024.