

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Integrated Science And Asian Culture (Isaac)



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Integrated Science And Asian Culture (Isaac) Academy

301 WESTWARD DR, Miami Springs, FL 33166

www.isacacademy.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.

Our mission at ISAAC is to foster student achievement by providing an innovative and challenging environment; to develop high academic standards; and to instill a sense of compassion and understanding for others, facilitated by a highly qualified staff.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a safe, nurturing and challenging environment, which will maximize individual achievement and the potential of each child.

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
Cuesta, Eleonora	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 intervention support and documentation and adequate professional development to support student achievement at the school. The Principal oversees and monitors the progress of data amongst all including that of the ESE sub-group. The Principal also communicates with parents regarding school-based plans and activities.
Rivas, Sandy	Administrative Support	Provides guidance, coordination, and support to promote learning gains for all students including those within the ESE sub-group. This involves collaborating on individualized education plans, analyzing student data, sharing effective instructional strategies, facilitating professional development, and fostering a positive and inclusive classroom environment. In addition, helps ensure that teachers including those servicing students within the ESE sub-group have the resources, tools, and expertise needed to create an equitable and successful learning experience for every student.

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.

A systematic effort involving multiple stakeholders is used to acquire an accurate and thorough picture of strengths and weaknesses of the school community thus identifying student needs through a variety of information-gathering techniques. Data analysis is conducted based on results from state standardized

assessments and i-Ready. The staff takes the lead to share data with parents and discuss areas for improvement. Family engagement continues to be of the utmost importance, activities with families are directly aligned with student achievement goals. Achievement data is shared in a clear, accurate and meaningful manner during all Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) meetings. All stakeholders support the implementation of an after-school tutoring program to help students close the reading gap. The tutoring program is implemented by using a research-based curriculum. Book fair funds are used to provide classrooms with books at varied reading levels to meet the needs of the students. Parents are equipped with Reading Strategy Guides during conferences that could be used at home to assist children. The reading coach, mentor and leadership team are consistently collaborating with teachers, utilizing data, and shared strategies to assist teachers to plan for differentiated instruction.

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 SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation of the action plan and its goals, particularly for students with the greatest achievement gap. This will be done through grade level meetings, data chats, faculty meetings and EESAC meetings. The data from progress monitoring assessments and diagnostic assessments, will be monitored and the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards. If revisions are needed to be made in the SIP, the team will meet with all stakeholders to receive input on revising the plan.

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)	Combination School KG-8
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	42%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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	0	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	8	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	

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

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

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

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	80	61	53	84	62	55	83		
ELA Learning Gains				76			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				71					
Math Achievement*	83	63	55	79	51	42	80		
Math Learning Gains				68			69		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68					
Science Achievement*	77	56	52	67	60	54	73		
Social Studies Achievement*		77	68		68	59			
Middle School Acceleration		75	70		61	51			
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	85	62	55		75	70	73		

** 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)	ATSI
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	404
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	513
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	42			
ELL	80			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	79			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	80			

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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	76			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	74			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	76			

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	80			83			77					85
SWD	38			46							2	
ELL	80			75							3	85
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	78			82			74				5	85
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	77			78			83				5	90

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	84	76	71	79	68	68	67					
SWD	33			42								
ELL	82	82		75	82		58					
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	83	77	70	79	69	70	67					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	87	76		80	70	73	70					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	83	69		80	69		73					73
SWD												
ELL	83	60		78	80		70					73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	83	66		80	69		71					73
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	83	60		83	60		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	84%	56%	28%	54%	30%
04	2023 - Spring	88%	58%	30%	58%	30%
03	2023 - Spring	78%	52%	26%	50%	28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	87%	63%	24%	59%	28%
04	2023 - Spring	88%	64%	24%	61%	27%
05	2023 - Spring	82%	58%	24%	55%	27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	75%	50%	25%	51%	24%

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.

The data component that performed the lowest is the ELA 3rd - 5th grade ESE subgroup with 38% proficiency in ELA. These students demonstrated deficiencies in comprehending informational texts. The contributing factors to last year's low performance were grade level expectations for that standard required understanding of technical vocabulary due to the complexity of the question. The trends found were that this was a standard that students across grade levels struggled with mastery. Therefore, an emphasis on informational text will be implemented from Kindergarten.

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

The data component showed an improvement of 5 points versus a decline from the prior year.

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.

While all of the grade levels were above the state average as it relates to proficiency, the Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroup 3- 5th grade ELA was the area that showed the greatest gap in comparison to the state's proficiency average. School's proficiency for the subgroup of SWD was 38% and State's Proficiency was 49%.

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 5th Grade Science, from 67% proficiency in 2022 to 75% in 2023. The domains showing gains were Nature and Science along with Earth and Space Science. The contributing factors were the use of the state's baseline, and the testing of topic assessments using Performance Matters to drive instruction, weekly usage of quizlet to study vocabulary and Gizmos for the hands-on application of the skills to support proficiency, and the student engagement in lessons based on the data from the district-provided PPT and state's practice tests.

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

The EWS data shows a need to improve the overall attendance percentage, with a focus on students that have 10 or more absences throughout the school year. The 2022-2023 data indicates that 14% of students have 10 or more absences.

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

The highest priorities for school improvement for the upcoming school year is the 3-5th Grade SWD subgroup for ELA, specifically with informational text. The other focus will be implementing a school-wide attendance program for students in kindergarten through 5th grade.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2022-2023 Student Attendance report, 1% of SWD in grades 3-5 had 10 or more absences. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of parents not understanding the importance of attendance correlation to academic success. The school will implement a targeted element of attendance incentive program.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to decrease the percentage of students in grades 3-5 in the indicated SWD subgroup with 10 or more absences by at least .5 percentage points from 1% to .5%.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by having a designated committee to monitor student attendance reports on a monthly basis to provide early interventions so students do not accumulate excessive absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sandy Rivas (srivas@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 evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus is to have the attendance committee print attendance reports. If any student is flagged the committee must meet with the parents whose children have accumulated 5 total absences to identify resources to parents to ensure students are in attendance daily.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is so parents can be provided with resources so their children attend school daily to obtain a quality education.

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 leadership team will identify individuals which will serve on the Attendance Review Committee. The committee will closely monitor student attendance and create an attendance incentive program.

Person Responsible: Sandy Rivas (srivas@dadeschools.net)

By When: Each class will have a 100% attendance chart so teachers can track the class daily attendance. The class with 100% for the week will receive a sticker and recognition during the morning announcements. Students will feel motivated to come to school.

A member of the Attendance Review Committee will generate the Daily Reason Attendance List to identify students with excessive absences.

Person Responsible: Sandy Rivas (srivas@dadeschools.net)

By When: The Daily Reason Attendance List will be generated on the last day of the month and submitted for review.

The Attendance Review Committee will address the parents of students with excessive absences via a letter and/or meeting.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Within the first week, after reviewing the prior month's Daily Reason Attendance List.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2022-2023 FAST ELA PM3, 38% of SWD in grades 3-5 were proficient in ELA. Based on the data the identified contributing factors to last year's low performance were grade level expectations for that standard required a deeper understanding of informational text due to the complexity of the questions, and a need for more differentiated instruction. The school will implement the Targeted Element of Benchmark-aligned Instruction with differentiation.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to increase the ELA proficiency in SWD grades 3rd-5th at least 3 percentage points on the FAST PM3 from 38% to 41%.

Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by having the Curriculum Coach plan with and support Reading teachers during instruction. I-Ready growth monitoring will be analyzed monthly to identify areas of concern. The leadership team will be providing walkthroughs and data chats as needed. Data of SWD will be analyzed 3 times per school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sandy Rivas (srivas@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.)

I-Ready instruction will be used as the evidence-based program to support growth in the area of informational text within the SWD subgroup.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

I-Ready's evidence-based approach allows for tailored instruction that caters to the specific needs of students with disabilities, promoting personalized learning experiences. I-Ready's continuous assessment and progress tracking helps educators identify areas of struggle and success for each student, enabling targeted differentiation to support individualized needs.

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.

Teachers will participate in data chat meetings to review student data from the prior year to identify the area of focus for the students. Based on data analysis, teachers at each grade level will be able to better

strategize the best practices and strategies needed in order to have purposeful differentiated and targeted lessons during their delivery of instruction.

Person Responsible: Sandy Rivas (srivas@dadeschools.net)

By When: Teachers will engage in professional growth practices during weekly planning focusing on differentiation and questioning skills for informational text to meet proficiency. Based on this, teachers will have a better understanding of what students' misconceptions are with specific benchmarks and will be able to better target their instruction and provide remediation opportunities for students.

3rd-5th SWDs will participate in an i-Ready Informational Text Challenge.

Person Responsible: Sandy Rivas (srivas@dadeschools.net)

By When: During the 2nd quarter of the year, students will be assigned lessons and participation will be monitored.

3rd-5th SWDs progress on i-Ready Growth Monitoring task will be analyzed for progress.

Person Responsible: Sandy Rivas (srivas@dadeschools.net)

By When: On a monthly basis, SWDs Growth Monitoring progress will be analyzed and action will be taken as needed.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The school improvement goals were established; the team determined how funds should be allocated to best support the indicated areas of concern. During a needs assessment it was determined that funds should be allocated for tutoring and for an attendance incentive program.