South PREP Scholars Academy School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

South PREP Scholars Academy

24555 SW 112TH AVENUE, Homestead, FL 33032

[no web address on file]

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.

South Prep Scholars Academy's mission is to develop and educate students through a whole child, multi-sensory approach that will provide them with the skills necessary for educational and social success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

South Prep Scholars Academy's vision is to build relationships between the school, students, families, and community members to help the students become socially responsible individuals who possess self-confidence, self-respect, and respect for others. We will empower students to learn, achieve their maximum academic potential, and obtain the confidence needed to succeed in secondary education and beyond.

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
de Armas, Dianet	Principal	The role of the principal is to communicate a clear and common vision and mission, that is consistent with the school's contract with the Sponsor. The principal will monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP), as well as the implementation of the school's educational programs. The principal will ensure that teachers are implementing the strategies in the SIP, as well as instruction that is aligned to the state standards, in order to maintain continuous improvement in the school, and address the needs of all students. Additionally, the principal will build relationships with the parents, and partnerships with the community, in order to nurture a positive school culture, that promotes student achievement, and student and parent engagement.
Porter, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	As lead teacher, Mrs. Porter is responsible for providing classroom support and guidance to teachers on the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. She will engage in collaborative planning with the teachers, to ensure that instruction is data driven, and that instructional decisions are based made on reviewing iReady data, Renaissance Star Assessment and topic assessment data. Mrs. Porter will provide coaching cycles, and professional development as needed, in order to build the instructional capacity of her team, and increase student achievement. Additionally, she will serve as a liaison between the principal and the grade level teachers. She will coordinate grade-wide activities, and support and lead her team to achieve the school's student achievement goals.

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

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

The schools leadership team and teachers will collaborate and implement strategies outlined in the SIP. The SIP will be shared with parents and discussed with the Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC). The SIP development process prioritizes engaging a diverse range of stakeholders to ensure a well-rounded and inclusive approach. Surveys, focus groups, and meetings are conducted to gather insights and feedback from each group. By involving stakeholders and valuing their input, the SIP becomes a collaborative effort that aligns with the shared vision of enhancing educational outcomes and driving positive change within the school.

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

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) will undergo regular monitoring to ensure its effectiveness in enhancing student achievement in line with the State's academic standards. Special attention will be given to addressing the achievement gap for students facing the most significant challenges. Data on student performance, attendance, and other relevant indicators will be collected and analyzed to check progress. The school leadership team, along with teachers, will hold regular review meetings to assess the impact of implemented strategies. Adjustments and revisions to the SIP will be data-driven, focusing on approaches that prove successful while targeting areas needing improvement. Stakeholder input will be sought and documented, ensuring a collaborative process.

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	100%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	5%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	
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)	
School Grades History	

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Absent 10% or more days	1	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	1	16	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	1	16	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
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	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	1	16	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
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*		60	53		62	56			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*		66	59		58	50			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		58	54		64	59			
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		63	59						

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

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

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
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				

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
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												

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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.

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.

At our school, this year's FAST assessment showed that reading scores were the lowest. This trend is influenced by the fact that 29 out of 65 students are ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) learners. ESOL students often face challenges in reading due to their ongoing language acquisition process. We are dedicated to supporting these students by providing specialized language instruction and tier 2 and 3 interventions to close the gap.

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

The decline in reading scores this year, compared to the previous year, can be attributed to the substantial increase in our ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) population, which rose from 20% to 44% of our total student population. This increase brought forth unique challenges, as ESOL students often face difficulties in reading comprehension while in the process of acquiring English language skills. Their limited English proficiency affected their ability to grasp vocabulary, context, and complex sentence structures crucial for reading comprehension, leading to lower scores. We recognize the need to intensify our support for ESOL students to bridge this gap and are actively working on tailored interventions and strategies to address their specific needs.

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.

The district does not have state wide data from the previous year.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was Differentiated Instruction(DI). Differentiated Instruction played a key role in student's academic improvement. Teachers implemented a DI routine during each class period, where they had three rotations, with students. This component demonstrated that if DI rotations are done with fidelity, student's academic performance will improve.

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

In our School Improvement Plan (SIP), the early warning system for attendance stands out as a significant concern for the current school year. We've observed challenges arising from various factors, including the ongoing impact of the pandemic and its effects on students' attendance patterns. Recognizing that consistent attendance is foundational to student success, we're committed to

addressing this concern head-on. Our SIP underscores the importance of proactive strategies, engagement initiatives, and targeted interventions to support students in overcoming attendance barriers. By focusing on this crucial aspect, we aim to foster a positive learning environment and ensure that every student has the opportunity to thrive academically and personally.

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

1. In the upcoming school year we want to challenge and provide more rigorous instruction to our higher-performing students. By offering more rigorous instruction tailored to their capabilities, we aspire to cultivate critical thinking, problem-solving skills, and a deeper engagement with the subjects to prepare them for their futures.

2. Our primary goal for the upcoming year is to significantly boost our attendance percentage across all grade levels. By fostering a culture of regular attendance through engaging learning experiences and effective communication with families, we aim to create a foundation for student success and active participation in the education.

3. Our primary focus this year will be on implementing targeted interventions for our ESOL students. We are dedicated to closing the achievement gap by providing tailored support to help ESOL students excel. Our goal is to ensure that every ESOL student receives the resources and assistance needed for academic success.

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 Other

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.

Upon a review of our school's data, it became evident that attendance is a important factor influencing student achievement and overall school environment. The analysis revealed a direct correlation between attendance rates and academic performance, with students exhibiting regular attendance consistently demonstrating higher levels of engagement and achievement. As a result, focusing on attendance emerged as a crucial need to ensure every student's equitable access to quality education and to foster a conducive learning environment for all.

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

Students in the lowest 25% of academic performance will demonstrate a 50% decrease in absenteeism.

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

To proactively address absenteeism and promote improved attendance rates, we will implement a comprehensive attendance monitoring system in the upcoming school year. We will pull weekly reports to monitor student's attendance and identify trends in their attendance. Regular communication with parents and guardians will be emphasized. We will organize workshops and meetings to educate families about the importance of attendance and involve them in creating a supportive home environment. Finally, To encourage consistent attendance, we will establish an Attendance Matters programs that celebrate students with excellent attendance records for the month. This positive reinforcement will promote a sense of achievement and responsibility.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dianet de Armas (964217@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.)

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports

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

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is a research-based approach that focuses on creating a positive and supportive school culture to improve attendance. PBIS employs a tiered system of support. For students with attendance issues, universal strategies like recognition for good attendance may sufficient. For students with chronic absenteeism, targeted interventions such as speaking to the mental health coordinator might help.

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. Weekly attendance monitoring report.
2. Constant communication and meetings with parents.
3. Create a positive attendance celebration to encourage achievement and responsibilities for students and parents.

Person Responsible: Dianet de Armas (964217@dadeschools.net)

By When: By December, our school will see a 10% decrease in absences in comparison with the 2022-2023 school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

Our primary focus this year will be on implementing targeted interventions for our ESOL students. We are dedicated to closing the achievement gap by providing tailored support to help ESOL students excel. Our goal is to ensure that every ESOL student receives the resources and assistance needed for academic success.

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

By the end of this school year, 70% of ESOL students in K-2nd grade will demonstrate a minimum of one year's academic growth on the FAST assessment in reading proficiency compared to their baseline scores at the beginning of the year.

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

We will regularly analyze data from the FAST assessments, formative assessments, and classroom performance to measure the progress of our ESOL students. This will allow us to identify trends, areas of improvement, and students in need of additional support. Teachers and specialists will provide ongoing progress reports for ESOL students, highlighting their academic growth, language proficiency development, and any challenges they face. We will conduct regular check-ins with ESOL students to gauge their confidence, engagement, and sense of belonging in the school environment. This will help us address any non-academic factors that may affect their performance.Our intervention programs and strategies will be closely monitored for effectiveness. We will adjust and refine interventions as needed based on ongoing assessments and feedback from teachers and specialists. At mid-year and end-of-year points, we will conduct comprehensive reviews of the data, progress reports, and intervention outcomes to assess the overall impact of our efforts.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dianet de Armas (964217@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 our ESOL students focuses on a structured, research-backed approach to improving their English language proficiency and academic performance. It includes targeted instruction in English language development, comprehension strategies, vocabulary acquisition, and culturally responsive teaching practices. The intervention is designed to meet the specific needs of ESOL students, and its effectiveness will be monitored through regular assessments and progress tracking to ensure that students make measurable gains in both language proficiency and subject-area achievement.

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

Providing targeted intervention is essential to address their specific needs. Evidence-based interventions are grounded in research and have a proven track record of effectiveness. By implementing such interventions, we can leverage best practices and strategies that have been shown to yield positive results for ESOL students. The intervention focuses not only on subject-area content but also on English language development. This is crucial for ESOL students as language proficiency is a fundamental building block for academic achievement in all subjects. By addressing comprehension strategies and

vocabulary acquisition, the intervention directly targets the skills necessary for improved reading comprehension and overall academic success. This aspect of the intervention promotes a sense of belonging and engagement. Regular assessment and progress tracking are integral components of the intervention, ensuring that its effectiveness is continuously evaluated. This data-driven approach allows for timely adjustments and refinements to better meet the evolving needs of ESOL students.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

The process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs begins with a comprehensive assessment of the school's specific requirements and priorities. This involves analyzing data, such as student performance, attendance, and demographic information, to identify areas that require targeted support. Next, a budgetary plan is developed, aligning available funds with the determined needs. This plan is crafted collaboratively, involving input from school administrators, teachers, and stakeholders to ensure a holistic perspective. Regular reviews and adjustments to the budget are conducted throughout the academic year to respond to evolving needs and changing circumstances, ensuring that resources are effectively allocated to maximize the impact on student success while maintaining transparency and accountability in the allocation process.