

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Green Springs High 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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	19
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	20

Green Springs High School

3555 NW 7TH ST, Miami, FL 33125

www.greensrpingshs.com

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Green Springs High School is to help at risk students earn a standard high school diploma and prepare for post secondary success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Green Springs High School is to provide quality education to all students regardless of their life circumstances, recognizing that at risk students have different needs, learn at different rates, and have diverse learning styles which cause many of these at risk students to drop out of school.

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
Leyva, Aimee	Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing instructional leadership, contractual accountability, and day-to-day leadership of educational and operational activities of the school. 2. Recruiting, hiring, and retaining highly qualified school staff. 3. Leading all initiatives to ensure school meets defined instructional goals. 4. Collecting and analyzing school data as the basis for monitoring and improving the school's measurable outcomes and contractual obligations with a focus on a cycle of continuous improvement. 5. Monitoring and evaluating staff performance systematically and regularly provide staff feedback and develop professional growth plans when necessary. Follow through with progressive discipline when expectations are not met. 6. Leading staff to accomplish the defined accountability measures to include contractual obligations and federal, state, and district requirements. 7. Fostering effective communication and relationships with all internal and external stakeholders which would include the company's mission and vision, performance results, school activities, and other information pertinent to the individual stakeholder groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff • Students • Parents • School district personnel • Charter School Board of Directors • Referring schools • District representatives • Community partners • Other stakeholders as identified
Nunez, Maria	Assistant Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Managing the academic progress of students; maintaining a climate conducive to teaching and learning; ensuring effective delivery and improvement of instruction; supervising, mentoring, and developing instructional staff; and ensuring that the school meets its defined goals. 2. Implementing research-based instructional practices aligned with the state standards. 3. Overseeing all aspects of the core academic program to include, but not be limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure fidelity of implementation of all approved academic software, off-line curriculum and assessments • Development of Individual Success Plans (ISP) • Ensure student academic records are accurate and up to date • On-going individual student academic advising • Student preparation and staff administration of all standardized assessments • Compliance with Exceptional Student Education (ESE) and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) requirements <p>The Assistant Principal collaborates with the principal to supervise and retain highly qualified instructional staff, ensuring instructional staff meets expectations for performance accountability, professional development initiatives in order to ensure that student educational and behavioral goals and objectives are achieved.</p>

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.

School leadership team works on developing the SIP. It is reviewed with the staff and then presented and discussed at an EESAC meeting where all stakeholders are represented and quorum established. Based on outcome of discussion, changes may be needed, if not, it is put up for approval and voted for or against.

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))

Data is analyzed and reviewed with faculty on a monthly basis. It is also discussed at each EESAC meeting. Mid-year and end of year reflection is completed based on data and also presented and voted upon at EESAC meetings. Data is desegregated to make sure progress is being made. Individual students are monitored to focus on strengthening weaknesses to increase academic achievement.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	98%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	27%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
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.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: COMMENDABLE

	2020-21: COMMENDABLE 2018-19: COMMENDABLE 2017-18: COMMENDABLE 2016-17: COMMENDABLE
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	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		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	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	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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	382	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	328	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	315	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	243

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	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in 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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide 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*	26	55	50	12	54	51	17		
ELA Learning Gains				18			10		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*		43	38	5	42	38			
Math Learning Gains				28					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		62	64	7	41	40	5		
Social Studies Achievement*		69	66	10	56	48	17		
Middle School Acceleration					56	44			
Graduation Rate	33	89	89	52	56	61	39		
College and Career Acceleration	13	70	65	15	67	67	16		
ELP Progress	49	49	45	12			20		

* 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	30
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	121
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	33

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	18
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	159
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	52

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	18	Yes	4	4
ELL	29	Yes	4	4
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	29	Yes	1	1
HSP	31	Yes	4	2
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	23	Yes	4	4

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	30	Yes	3	3
ELL	14	Yes	3	3
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	18	Yes	3	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	18	Yes	3	3

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	26									33	13	49
SWD										7	2	
ELL										10	3	49
AMI												
ASN												
BLK											1	
HSP	27									13	4	49
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										14	2	

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	12	18		5	28		7	10		52	15	12
SWD										41	18	
ELL	5			0			8	0		56	14	12
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	12	18		5	29		8	11		51	15	12
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	9	18		4	33		9	14		51	14	13

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	17	10					5	17		39	16	20
SWD										36	6	
ELL										31	12	20
AMI												
ASN												
BLK										14		
HSP	20						6	17		40	16	20
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										50		
FRL	20									37	17	18

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	17%	54%	-37%	50%	-33%
09	2023 - Spring	8%	51%	-43%	48%	-40%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	7%	56%	-49%	50%	-43%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	0%	52%	-52%	48%	-48%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	7%	65%	-58%	63%	-56%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	9%	66%	-57%	63%	-54%

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.

Math Achievement showed the lowest performance at 5%. A majority of the students that had not passed the Algebra EOC came in at a Level 1.

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

Our students come in with at least 2 grade levels below in reading, at an average of 4th grade level and with minimal math skills. Therefore, our data trends have been similar for the last three years. There hasn't been a significant decline in any subject area as compared to years past.

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.

Math state averages are at 32% whereas Green Springs is at 5%. Our students lack foundational math skills and 95% came in at a Level 1.

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

Graduation rate had the greatest improvement from 39 to 52. We had daily interventions in math and reading. they worked one-on-one with the content area teachers to close their classes. Administration met with teachers monthly to review data and placed students on performance plans depending on their progress or lack thereof.

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

Does not apply to grades 9-12 but our biggest challenge are the students that have more than 10% absent and the number of Level 1's and 2's that attend our school.

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

1. Attendance
2. ELP students
3. Math achievement
4. ELA Achievement

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 Math**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.

Students math achievement came in lower than the year prior and basic skills were greatly lacking.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Green Springs will focus on increasing achievement in Math by at least 2 percentage points by June 2024 as evident in their state assessment scores and as reflected on the School Improvement Rating (SIR).

Monitoring:

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

Interventionists, advisory teachers and administration will be monitoring results of state assessments, weekly and monthly standards assessments as well. Administration will conduct regular walkthroughs to ensure direct instruction is being implemented daily.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aimee Leyva (943896@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.)

Students that have been identified as having deficits in algebraic skills will receive direct and differentiated instruction to increase achievement level in small groups and individually.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students who are deficient in math must receive differentiated instruction to address their individual needs. Targeting deficiencies and reviewing test taking strategies will help increase proficiency which will lead to higher results on standardized assessments.

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 3 - Promising 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.

Identify students that have not passed the Algebra 1 EOC and identify math deficiencies.

Person Responsible: Aimee Leyva (943896@dadeschools.net)

By When: Within a week of student enrollment since we it is on-going for us.

1. Develop instructional focus calendar for math based on the testing calendar for re-takers.
2. Ensure that planned instruction is delivered with fidelity.
3. Monitor Direct Instruction targeting individualized deficiencies.

Person Responsible: Aimee Leyva (943896@dadeschools.net)

By When: Focus calendar has already been completed. Steps 2 and 3 are on-going.

#2. 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.

Having a positive culture and environment will lead to the students feeling supported. This will, in turn, raise attendance, retention and achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students achievement should increase by 2% in ELA and Math achievement

Monitoring:

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

Interventionists, advisory teachers and administration will be monitoring results of state and in house assessments on a monthly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aimee Leyva (943896@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.)

Students that have not passed the FSA/FAST and Algebra EOC/BEST will receive direct and differentiated instruction to increase achievement level in small groups and individually.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students who are deficient in math must receive differentiated instruction to address their individual needs. Addressing individual needs leads to a fulfilling environment. Targeting deficiencies and reviewing test taking strategies will help increase proficiency which will lead to higher results on assessments.

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)).

School improvement funding allocations are first discussed with the staff during department and faculty meetings. After we come to an agreement, they are presented at EESAC meetings and voted on for approval. Then they are discussed with the board at our quarterly meetings or more often if necessary.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

N/A

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

N/A

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No