Miami Dade Virtual High School Franchise School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Miami Dade Virtual High School Franchise

560 NW 151ST STREET, Miami, FL 33169

mdvs.dadeschools.net

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Dade County School Board on 10/11/2023.

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.

We are committed to providing a comprehensive educational opportunity that meets the needs of each student in a unified K-12 virtual school setting that has high expectations and encourages students to achieve their full potential. Furthermore, our goal is to foster effective communication, cooperation, and support between home, school, and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Miami Dade Virtual School allows students to thrive in a premier virtual academic experience.
We foster independence and responsibility in all our students to be competitive in a global community.

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
Diaz-Rubio, Ivette	Principal	As the school's principal, Ms. Diaz-Rubio provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students, grades K - 12. Data is utilized to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others whilst building capacity, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Ms. Diaz-Rubio establishes high expectations for all students and ensures that the school-based team is implementing a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS)
Gonzalez-Amador, Audrie	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Gonzalez-Amador is the ESE Consultation Teacher for students in grades K - 2. She assists general education teachers with accommodations, services, and goals relating to their Students with Disabilities.
Firtell, Wendy	Teacher, K-12	Dr. Firtell is the second grade teacher. She implements a variety of instructional technique levels through rigorous instruction which includes, but is not limited to, guided reading groups, whole group instruction, and the use of various ESOL Strategies. She observes and assesses student performance and keeps thorough records of progress. as a teacher, Dr. Firtell also provides differentiated instruction according to the student ability and skill level. Additionally, Dr. Firtell also serves as the Designated Building Union Steward who cultivates positive relationships between fellow teachers and school administrators
Labrousse, Lorrine	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Labrousse is the Math Department Chair. She collaborates with the math teachers to share best practices in engagement. She reviews data with the department and informs the teachers of updates from the district and Professional Development offerings. Additionally, Ms. Labrousse serves as the school's Digital Innovator in the Professional Learning Support Team. She evaluates emerging Instructional Technology tools and shares them with the faculty to improve practices related to instructional delivery and engagement, assessment, and to facilitate the learning.
Rolle, Erika	Assistant Principal	Dr. Rolle is the school's assistant principal. She works collaboratively with all stakeholders to monitor student progress and provide effective interventions. Dr. Rolle oversees the Student Services department and works closely with all members on the master schedule, tracking students to ensure that they are progressing, and is also involved with the MTSS process. Additionally, Dr. Rolle works closely with the Testing Department Chair to create schedules for testing, monitor testing, and coordinate make-up exams as needed.

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 PLST team reviews the previous year's data and drafts the School Improvement Plan while at the district conference over the summer. The draft is shared with the faculty at the opening of schools meeting for review. The plan is updated accordingly and then presented for review to the EESAC committee representing all stakeholders. The plan is updated accordingly based on the stakeholders input throughout the school year.

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))

Classroom walkthroughs, student progress monitoring, department/grade level input, staff feedback, parental and community input will be reviewed monthly and discussed with the leadership team in the Curriculum Council meetings and shared with stakeholders at the faculty and EESAC meetings. Adjustments will be made based on data and stakeholder feedback as needed throughout the year.

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-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	95%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	11%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: I
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	0	7	6	6	5	8	17	25	74
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	4	10	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	9	44	59
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	12	18	14	23	13	81
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	42	28	34	23	31	159
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	2	15	23	33	29	50	43	197
	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	2	11	19	17	27	36	112

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	1	0	0	0	2	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2

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	6	10	24	9	23	23	40	42	323
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	8	19	6	25	17	8	20	189
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	13	2	16	9	32	25	138
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	27	23	36	14	28	188
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	52	49	75	29	38	336
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	5	22	24	39	48	37	46	341

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	14	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	17

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	7	3	8	4	6	21	26	32	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	0	2	7	9	23	43
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	2	3	13	48	33	100
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	20	20	25	18	35	141
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	44	46	32	40	26	43	231
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	3	13	34	35	36	52	47	71	293

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	1	20	22	20	31	39	48	181

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	8

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*	50	61	53	49	62	55			
ELA Learning Gains				53					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40					
Math Achievement*	29	63	55	27	51	42			
Math Learning Gains				39					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36					
Science Achievement*	39	56	52	30	60	54			
Social Studies Achievement*	56	77	68	51	68	59			
Middle School Acceleration	43	75	70	39	61	51			
Graduation Rate	71	76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration	52	73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	50	62	55	36	75	70			

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	437
Total Components for the Federal Index	9

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	92
Graduation Rate	71

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	400
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	78
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	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	2	
HSP	50			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	36	Yes	1	

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%
2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
SWD	32	Yes	1	
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	44			
MUL	48			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	43			

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)

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
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	50			29			39	56	43	71	52	50
SWD	32			29			26	54		36	7	
ELL	36			23			37	31		75	8	50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42			17			33	58	27		7	
HSP	52			33			41	53	48	55	9	42
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	61			40						31	4	
FRL	40			14			8	36		47	6	

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	49	53	40	27	39	36	30	51	39			36
SWD	31	38	33	21	32	33	26	47	31			
ELL	49	48	42	26	33	37	36	42	25			36
AMI												
ASN	80	91		67	80							
BLK	44	47	40	22	39	43	31	65	26			
HSP	58	55	40	35	38	32	44	70	37			33
MUL	50			46								
PAC												
WHT	60	63		53	39		63					
FRL	53	51	40	28	37	36	41	68	36			35

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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	63%	54%	9%	50%	13%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	56%	-8%	54%	-6%
07	2023 - Spring	52%	50%	2%	47%	5%
08	2023 - Spring	50%	51%	-1%	47%	3%
09	2023 - Spring	54%	51%	3%	48%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	58%	-6%	58%	-6%
06	2023 - Spring	50%	50%	0%	47%	3%
03	2023 - Spring	44%	52%	-8%	50%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	35%	58%	-23%	54%	-19%
07	2023 - Spring	34%	48%	-14%	48%	-14%
03	2023 - Spring	18%	63%	-45%	59%	-41%
04	2023 - Spring	22%	64%	-42%	61%	-39%
08	2023 - Spring	38%	59%	-21%	55%	-17%
05	2023 - Spring	28%	58%	-30%	55%	-27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	14%	40%	-26%	44%	-30%
05	2023 - Spring	45%	50%	-5%	51%	-6%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	28%	56%	-28%	50%	-22%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	38%	52%	-14%	48%	-10%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	65%	-5%	63%	-3%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	57%	68%	-11%	66%	-9%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	48%	66%	-18%	63%	-15%

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.

Overall, the area of Mathematics in grades 3-8 had the lowest performance. In terms of students scoring level 1 or 2. The following is the percent of levels 1 and 2 per grade:
Grade 3: 87%
Grade 4: 33%
Grade 5: 72%
Grade 6: 69%
Grade 7: 68%
Grade 8: 78%
The average for all grades is approx. 67% of students scoring a Level 1 or Level 2, meaning only 33% of students, just over one quarter of students demonstrating proficiency in Mathematics. It is believed that teachers of Mathematics are still struggling to find engaging best practices for virtual Mathematics and are in search of instructional strategies that replace the use of manipulatives in the traditional classroom. Topic assessments are also not a tool that teachers can use to effectively gauge the progress of students effectively because the Pacing Guides and aligned Topic Assessments are not aligned with the curriculum used in MDVS therefore may not be representative of what students should know. MDVS uses FLVS curriculum for Schoology and it was not all updated to the BEST standards.

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

77 out of 313 students (25%) in grades 4-8 who had a previous score from 21-22 school year and who also completed the 22-23 Mathematics PM3 dropped by at least one subgroup or level. If the issues regarding the struggle with effective mathematics in the virtual setting are true, 2 years of compounded

struggle in the virtual setting (in MDVS, not to mention pandemic setbacks) may have caused the drop in the assessment score.

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.

State average in Math proficiency in grades 3-8 is approximately 56%.
School average in Math proficiency in grades 3-8 is approximately 33%, a difference of 23 percentage points. In particular, grades 3 and 4 have the greatest disparity. Grade 3 proficiency is 41 percentage points lower than the state average and grade 4 is 39 percentage points lower than the state average. Research states that students, especially younger students building mathematical foundations, require hands-on activities and the use of manipulatives to assist in abstract mathematical learning. In the virtual setting, it is difficult to replace these powerful in-person strategies, especially with struggling learners. Teachers will require innovative tools and approaches to address this instructional gap and review the research in virtual techniques for teaching mathematics.

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

We had 62% proficiency in the 10th grade Reading FSA. 8 percentage points higher than the district and 13 percentage points higher than the state. We provided the teachers with professional development held data chats to monitor progress.

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

Attendance continues to be a concern for MDVS given the fragility of the population and the need for students to log in to homeroom and then continue to log-in and stay logged in throughout the day, at times without supervision of adults at home, with internet or technology issues, or other varying barriers.

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

Increased engagement strategies for for all courses specifically in Mathematics. Increased use of Differentiated Instruction and interventions based on needs in the Mathematics classroom. Increased collaboration to share best practices as a it relates to instructional practices and curriculum alignment, specifically in Mathematics.

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 Student Engagement

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 FAST 22-23 PM3 data, overall proficiency scores for all subject areas tested averaged under 50% proficiency. Based on this data and the identified contributing factors of a high number of students not demonstrating overall proficiency, we need to increase student engagement to ensure that students are effectively engaged in the learning process to achieve academic success. We will implement the targeted element of student engagement.

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

According to the FAST 22-23 PM3 data, overall proficiency scores for all subject areas tested averaged under 50% proficiency. Based on this data and the identified contributing factors of high number of students not demonstrating overall proficiency, we will implement the targeted element of student engagement through an Interactive Learning Environment, to increase proficiency by 4% in the areas of ELA and Math throughout the K-12 population by the June 2023-2024 state assessments.

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

The administrative team will conduct walk-throughs to monitor student engagement and provide teachers with feedback.
Monthly department/grade level meetings will be discussing best practices in reference to increasing student engagement.
The review of PM1 and iReady data will provide us with our students' current academic proficiency levels to assess needs and next steps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ivette Diaz-Rubio (diazrubio@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.)

Interactive Learning Environments allows students to interact with visual aides/scaffolds that support the acquisition or assimilation of prerequisite skills, academic vocabulary, and instructional/metacognitive processes.

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

Interactive learning encourages active participation, collaboration, and discussion among students. When students are engaged, they are more likely to retain information and understand complex concepts effectively. Interactive learning can help mitigate student disengagement. When students find learning enjoyable and rewarding, they are more likely to stay motivated and committed to their studies.

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.

We will establish guidelines for online engagement for students and parents and review it with them at student assemblies and open house. This will help students increase proficiency by 4% in all tested areas.

Person Responsible: Ivette Diaz-Rubio (diazrubio@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 25, 2023

The administrative team will conduct walkthroughs focusing on student engagement to identify 5 model teachers across varying grade levels and subject areas that can be observed by other teachers to increase student engagement and overall proficiency by 4%.

Person Responsible: Ivette Diaz-Rubio (diazrubio@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 15, 2023

We will establish a schedule for teachers to observe model teachers in the process of student engagement in order to share best practices to increase proficiency in all areas by 4%.

Person Responsible: Ivette Diaz-Rubio (diazrubio@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

Faculty members will participate in peer observation of teaching. This model will allow teachers to observe lessons and focus on student engagement best practices.

Person Responsible: Ivette Diaz-Rubio (diazrubio@dadeschools.net)

By When: 1/19/24

The teacher who observes "Student Engagement Model Classrooms" will reflect and determine which observed best practices can be used within their own teaching practices.

Person Responsible: Ivette Diaz-Rubio (diazrubio@dadeschools.net)

By When: 1/19/24

#2. 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.

According to the FAST 22-23 PM3 data, overall proficiency scores for in Math tested averaged under 50% proficiency. Based on this data and the identified contributing factors of a high number of students not demonstrating overall proficiency, we need to implement interventions to ensure that students are effectively progressing to achieve academic success. We will implement the targeted element of intervention to ensure an increase of proficiency in math.

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

According to the FAST 22-23 PM3 data, overall proficiency scores for in math averaged under 50% proficiency. Based on this data and the identified contributing factors of high number of students not demonstrating overall proficiency, we will implement the targeted element of implementing interventions to increase proficiency by 4% in the areas of Math throughout the K-12 population by the June 2023-2024 state assessments.

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

The administrative team will conduct walk-throughs to monitor the interventions and provide teachers with feedback.
Monthly department/grade level meetings will be discussing best practices in reference to interventions in math.
The review of PM1 and iReady data will provide us with our students' current academic proficiency levels to assess needs and next steps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ivette Diaz-Rubio (diazrubio@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.)

Intervention is a strategy used to teach a new skill, build fluency in a skill, or encourage a child to apply an existing skill to new situations or settings.

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

Interventions can be tailored to accommodate various learning styles and individual needs. Interventions can play a crucial role in closing achievement gaps between students who are performing at different levels in mathematics. By providing support to students who may be struggling or falling behind in mathematics, these interventions can help bridge the gaps in understanding.

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.

We will identify level 1 and level 2 students in mathematics that require intervention.

Person Responsible: Ivette Diaz-Rubio (diazrubio@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

We will identify resources that will be used for the implementation of intervention in mathematics.

Person Responsible: Lorrine Labrousse (218933@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

We will develop a schedule for math teachers to implement the math interventions.

Person Responsible: Erika Rolle (199870@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

Elementary and secondary representatives attend Mathematics iCad trainings. Share-out's occur during department/grade collaborative meetings.

Person Responsible: Ivette Diaz-Rubio (diazrubio@dadeschools.net)

By When: 1/19/24

Student data chats have been conducted based on Quarterly assessment results.
The outcome of data determines intervention groups. Elementary teachers use: Big Ideas, i-Ready teacher toolbox, i-Ready teacher assigned lessons and Reflex Math. Middle School teachers use: i-Ready lessons, and IXL while High School teachers use Khan Academy.

Person Responsible: Ivette Diaz-Rubio (diazrubio@dadeschools.net)

By When: 1/19/2024

Elementary and secondary representatives attend Mathematics iCad trainings. Share-out's occur during department/grade collaborative meetings.

Person Responsible: Ivette Diaz-Rubio (diazrubio@dadeschools.net)

By When: 1/19/24

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance

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 Power BI data 60% of staff had 10.5 or more absences. Based on this data and the identified contributing factors of having 60% of staff with 10.5 or more absences, we will implement the targeted element of teacher attendance supported by Celebrate Successes.

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

According to the 2022-2023 Power BI data 60% of staff had 10.5 or more absences. Based on this data and the identified contributing factors of having 60% of staff with 10.5 or more absences, we will implement the targeted element of Celebrate Successes to increase staff attendance by 10% by June 2024.

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

The payroll clerk will provide the staff attendance report to administration at the end of each month. This will allow us to celebrate staff members that have had perfect attendance for the month at our monthly faculty meeting.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erika Rolle (199870@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.)

Celebrate Successes is when staff and student accomplishments are given special recognition and achievements are publicly celebrated allowing for encouragement from all stakeholders. Showing the connection between effort and achievement helps students to see the importance of effort and allows them to change their beliefs to emphasize it more. Recognition is more effective if it is contingent on achieving some specified standard.

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

By recognizing employees with continuous, good attendance, this reinforces the importance of punctuality and reliability, encouraging others to follow suit. It creates a culture where attendance is valued and appreciated. When employees see their efforts acknowledged and rewarded, it fosters a sense of pride and satisfaction in their work. This, in turn, increases their overall job satisfaction and commitment to the organization.

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.

Establish rewards and recognition initiative along with a timeline to celebrate successes.

Person Responsible: Erika Rolle (199870@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14, 2023

Share the plan with teachers at the opening of schools meeting.

Person Responsible: Erika Rolle (199870@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14, 2023

Have the list of teachers with 100% attendance for August ready to share and celebrate for the September Faculty meeting.

Person Responsible: Erika Rolle (199870@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 6, 2023

During monthly faculty meetings, those faculty members who have perfect will continue being highlighted and rewarded.

Person Responsible: Erika Rolle (199870@dadeschools.net)

By When: 1/19/24

Those teachers who have perfect attendance monthly will be recognized during faculty meetings. Those teachers who also have perfect attendance throughout the entire quarter, will receive an additional incentive.

Person Responsible: Erika Rolle (199870@dadeschools.net)

By When: 1/19/24

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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 FAST 22-23 data, overall proficiency scores for the ESSA Subgroups of Black/African American, SWD, and English Language Learners were less then 41%. Based on this data and the identified contributing factors of Black/African American, SWD, and English Language Learners subgroups scoring less that 41% proficiency we need to effectively progress monitor to ensure that students are demonstrating progress to achieve academic success. We will implement the target element of Ongoing Progress Monitoring.

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

According to the FAST 22-23 PM3 data, overall proficiency scores for the ESSA Subgroups of Black/African American, SWD, and English Language Learners were less then 41%. Based on this data and the identified contributing factors of high number of students not demonstrating overall proficiency in these subgroups, we will implement the target element of Ongoing Progress Monitoring to increase proficiency by 4% in the areas of ELA and Math throughout the K-12 population by the June 2023-2024 state assessment.

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

The administrative team will conduct walk-throughs to monitor student engagement and interventions to provide teachers with feedback.
Monthly department/grade level meetings will be discussing best practices in reference to increasing student engagement, interventions and progress monitoring.
The review of PM1 and iReady data will provide us with our students' current academic proficiency levels to assess needs and next steps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Ivette Diaz-Rubio (diazrubio@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.)

Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) is used to assess students' academic performance, to quantify a student rate of improvement or responsiveness to instruction, and to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction. OPM can be implemented with individual students or an entire class.

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

Ongoing Progress monitoring for specific subgroups allows educators to tailor interventions and support to meet the unique needs of different student populations. By identifying struggling subgroups, educators can develop targeted strategies to improve their academic performance and close achievement gaps.

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.

Identify the students that fall in each of the subgroups and place students in specific intervention to address their needs.

Person Responsible: Ivette Diaz-Rubio (diazrubio@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

Identify the resources that can be used to provide targeted interventions.

Person Responsible: Ivette Diaz-Rubio (diazrubio@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

Develop a schedule to implement the interventions.

Person Responsible: Ivette Diaz-Rubio (diazrubio@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

Following student data chats, the faculty members will meet with the administrative team to review intervention protocol based on PM1 results from 2023-2024.

Person Responsible: Ivette Diaz-Rubio (diazrubio@dadeschools.net)

By When: 1/19/24

Students who are showing an academic deficiency in a core subject will receive documented academic advisement by a grade level guidance counselor.

Person Responsible: Ivette Diaz-Rubio (diazrubio@dadeschools.net)

By When: 1/19/24

#5. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

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

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

#6. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

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

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

#7. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

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

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

#8. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

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

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

#9. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

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

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

#10. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

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

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 funding structure for MDVS is different than standard schools as we are virtual. We are working with our district to effectively address our low performance needs.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Interventions can be tailored to accommodate various learning styles and individual needs. Interventions can play a crucial role in closing achievement gaps between students who are performing at different levels in mathematics. By providing support to students who may be struggling or falling behind in mathematics, these interventions can help bridge the gaps in understanding.
Teachers will participate in the Reading Horizons professional development to learn how to implement this intervention.
Students in levels 1 and 2 are scheduled in the reading intervention class to receive a minimum of 30 minutes of reading intervention daily using the structured Reading Horizons program. Currently, we have one student in 1st grade and two students in 2nd grade that scored a level 1 or 2 in reading scheduled in the reading intervention course.
Teachers will progress monitor these students through iReady and FAST assessment results throughout the year to ensure that progress is being made in reading.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Interventions can be tailored to accommodate various learning styles and individual needs. Interventions can play a crucial role in closing achievement gaps between students who are performing at different levels in mathematics. By providing support to students who may be struggling or falling behind in mathematics, these interventions can help bridge the gaps in understanding.
Teachers will participate in the Reading Horizons professional development to learn how to implement this intervention.
Students in levels 1 and 2 are scheduled in the reading intervention class to receive a minimum of 30 minutes of reading intervention daily using the structured Reading Horizons program. Currently, we have 11 students in 3rd grade, 30 students in 4th grade, and 30 students in 5th grade that scored a level 1 or 2 in reading scheduled in the reading intervention course.
Teachers will progress monitor these students through iReady and FAST assessment results throughout the year to ensure that progress is being made in reading.

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

With the implementation of Reading Intervention, we will increase proficiency by 4% in the area of reading in grades K-2 by the 2023-2024 state assessment in June.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

With the implementation of Reading Intervention, we will increase proficiency by 4% in the area of reading in grades 3-5 by the 2023-2024 state assessment in June.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The administrative team will conduct walk-throughs to ensure that teachers are implementing the reading intervention.
Monthly department/grade level meetings will be discussing best practices.
The review of FAST PM1, PM2 and iReady data will be conducted after each administration to review student progress.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Diaz-Rubio, Ivette, diazrubio@dadeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The Reading Horizons Intervention program is provided by the district for all students in grades K-5. This program addresses the need to increase reading proficiency and has a proven record of effectiveness when used with fidelity.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The Reading Horizons Intervention program is provided by the district for all students in grades K-5. This program addresses the need to increase reading proficiency and has a proven record of effectiveness when used with fidelity.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Teachers will participate in the Reading Horizons professional development to learn how to implement this intervention on 8/15/23. Professional Learning	Rolle, Erika, erollemodel@dadeschools.net
Students in levels 1 and 2 are scheduled in the reading intervention class to receive a minimum of 30 minutes of reading intervention daily using the structured Reading Horizons program. Schedules will be completed by 8/16/23. Literacy Leadership	Diaz-Rubio, Ivette, diazrubio@dadeschools.net

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: Student Engagement	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Attendance	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
7	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
8	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
9	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
10	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	$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