

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Marcus A. Milam K 8 Center School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>10</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>14</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>24</b> |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>27</b> |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>27</b> |

## Marcus A. Milam K 8 Center

6020 W 16TH AVE, Hialeah, FL 33012

<http://milam.dadeschools.net/>

### 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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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.**

At M. A. Milam K-8 Center, we strive to provide an atmosphere that nurtures our learners from their early stages of development through their formative adolescent years. Our teachers and staff establish a positive educational environment for students by enhancing academic achievement, developing social and communication skills, and promoting independence and mutual respect. We strive to work together with our parents and community, knowing that this collaboration helps cultivate the whole child.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Our vision at M. A. Milam K-8 Center is to empower all learners to excel in their academic goals, demonstrate strong core values, and become productive members of the 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   |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Hernandez, Anna    | Principal           | <p>The role of a principal is to provide strategic direction in the school system. Principals assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer budget, hire and evaluate staff, and oversee facilities.</p>   |
| Judge, Michelle    | Assistant Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* discussing student behavior and learning problems with parents</li> <li>* implementing school safety procedures ensuring compliance</li> <li>* handling disciplinary issues observing and evaluating teachers providing meaningful feedback and support to * teachers regarding curriculum standards and learning materials</li> <li>* overseeing the maintenance of school facilities and grounds</li> <li>* purchasing supplies and equipment or approving supply orders</li> <li>* managing attendance</li> <li>* collaborating with other administrators to set budgets</li> <li>* tracking performance and attendance systems</li> <li>* hiring and training faculty and staff coordinating school schedules</li> </ul> |
| Canal, Robert      | Math Coach          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• work with teachers to improve mathematics achievement</li> <li>• manage and control curriculum and instructional materials</li> <li>• manage and regulate professional development</li> <li>• monitor program implementation</li> <li>• build the mathematics program by using its strengths and reducing its weaknesses</li> </ul>  |
| Liscano, Lorena    | School Counselor    | <p>The counselor offers guidance to students relating to academic, personal/ social, and career development. Additionally, the counselor provides group counseling sessions to address student needs.</p>   |
| Galeano, Erica     | Reading Coach       | <p>The reading coach works with teachers to implement ELA curriculum and instructional materials, as well as ensure program implementation, and monitor the fidelity of the ELA intervention program.</p>   |
| Herrera, Christina | Assistant Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* discussing student behavior and learning problems with parents</li> <li>* implementing school safety procedures ensuring compliance</li> <li>* handling disciplinary issues observing and evaluating teachers providing meaningful feedback and support to * teachers regarding curriculum standards and learning materials</li> <li>* overseeing the maintenance of school facilities and grounds</li> <li>* purchasing supplies and equipment or approving supply orders</li> <li>* managing attendance</li> <li>* collaborating with other administrators to set budgets</li> <li>* tracking performance and attendance systems</li> <li>* hiring and training faculty and staff coordinating school schedules</li> </ul> |

**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 EESAC of M. A. Milam K-8 Center includes all required stakeholders. All stakeholders are included via regularly scheduled EESAC, faculty, leadership, department, grade-level, and PTSA meetings (where feedback is solicited and recorded).

**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))

Administration will meet with instructional coaches monthly for progress checks. The leadership team will conduct regular walkthroughs and data analysis to monitor implementation and progress.

| Demographic Data   |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Other School<br>PK-8                                 |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education                               |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | Yes  |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 100%   |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 95%  |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No   |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Identification</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) |  |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: B<br>2019-20: B<br>2018-19: B<br>2017-18: B |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |  |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>   |  |

**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   | 21          | 22 | 8  | 15 | 12 | 19 | 13 | 18 | 20  | 148   |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   |       |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 4  | 1  | 4  | 1  | 3  | 9  | 13 | 1   | 36    |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 5  | 0  | 9  | 9  | 17 | 1  | 5  | 6   | 52    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 56 | 44 | 45 | 68 | 47 | 72  | 332   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 31 | 32 | 51 | 40 | 30 | 34  | 218   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 30          | 46 | 30 | 70 | 55 | 70 | 97 | 78 | 100 | 576   |

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           | 5 | 1 | 36 | 31 | 46 | 38 | 35 | 40 | 232   |

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 | 1 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 19    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7     |

**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           | 22 | 6 | 11 | 8  | 16 | 22 | 19 | 17 | 121   |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 2  | 4     |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 2  | 4 | 10 | 3  | 4  | 7  | 2  | 8  | 40    |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 2  | 4 | 7  | 6  | 9  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 43    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 11 | 8  | 20 | 28 | 30 | 41 | 138   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 9  | 17 | 30 | 40 | 27 | 36 | 159   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 1  | 8 | 30 | 14 | 28 | 53 | 67 | 69 | 270   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |    |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 2 | 4 | 12 | 9 | 21 | 30 | 23 | 34 | 135   |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 3 | 3 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 29    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7     |

**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           | 22 | 6 | 11 | 8  | 16 | 22 | 19 | 17 | 121   |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 2  | 4     |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 2  | 4 | 10 | 3  | 4  | 7  | 2  | 8  | 40    |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 2  | 4 | 7  | 6  | 9  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 43    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 11 | 8  | 20 | 28 | 30 | 41 | 138   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 9  | 17 | 30 | 40 | 27 | 36 | 159   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 1  | 8 | 30 | 14 | 28 | 53 | 67 | 69 | 270   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |    |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 2 | 4 | 12 | 9 | 21 | 30 | 23 | 34 | 135   |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 3 | 3 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 29    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7     |

**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.

**District and State data will be uploaded when available.**

| Accountability Component        | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                                 | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement*                | 50     |          |       | 44     |          |       | 54     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              | 66     |          |       | 40     |          |       | 60     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      | 61     |          |       | 34     |          |       | 56     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 50     |          |       | 39     |          |       | 59     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             | 66     |          |       | 35     |          |       | 62     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     | 59     |          |       | 30     |          |       | 53     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 45     |          |       | 37     |          |       | 52     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     | 68     |          |       | 59     |          |       | 72     |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      | 68     |          |       | 61     |          |       | 73     |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        |          |       |        |          |       |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          |       |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    | 66     |          |       | 51     |          |       | 69     |          |       |

\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |     |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 60  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 0   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 599 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 10  |
| Percent Tested                                 | 99  |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

| <b>2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b> |  |                           |  |  |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b>                      | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
| SWD                                       | 48                                     |                           |  |  |
| ELL                                       | 53                                     |                           |  |  |
| AMI                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| BLK                                       | 60                                     |                           |  |  |
| HSP                                       | 60                                     |                           |  |  |
| MUL                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| PAC                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| FRL                                       | 59                                     |                           |  |  |

**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)

| <b>2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
|---|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                      | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2020-21</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2020-21</b> | <b>ELP Progress</b> |
| All Students  | 50              | 66            | 61                 | 50               | 66             | 59                  | 45              | 68             | 68               |                          |                                | 66                  |
| SWD   | 33              | 55            | 55                 | 41               | 55             | 47                  | 41              | 57             |                  |                          |                                | 50                  |
| ELL   | 42              | 63            | 64                 | 44               | 60             | 53                  | 30              | 67             | 43               |                          |                                | 66                  |
| AMI   |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| ASN   |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| BLK   | 45              | 70            |                    | 55               | 70             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| HSP   | 50              | 66            | 61                 | 50               | 65             | 58                  | 45              | 67             | 67               |                          |                                | 66                  |
| MUL   |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| PAC   |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| WHT   |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| FRL   | 49              | 66            | 61                 | 49               | 65             | 58                  | 44              | 67             | 65               |                          |                                | 66                  |

| 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                                   | 44       | 40     | 34          | 39        | 35      | 30           | 37       | 59      | 61        |                   |                     | 51           |
| SWD  | 33       | 32     | 25          | 32        | 34      | 33           | 25       | 25      |           |                   |                     | 51           |
| ELL  | 38       | 37     | 32          | 34        | 35      | 24           | 27       | 50      | 57        |                   |                     | 51           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 45       |        |             | 45        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 45       | 41     | 35          | 39        | 35      | 29           | 37       | 59      | 61        |                   |                     | 51           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 43       | 40     | 36          | 38        | 35      | 30           | 36       | 55      | 57        |                   |                     | 51           |

| 2018-19 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 54       | 60     | 56          | 59        | 62      | 53           | 52       | 72      | 73        |                   |                     | 69           |
| SWD  | 33       | 47     | 52          | 35        | 45      | 45           | 28       | 29      |           |                   |                     | 54           |
| ELL  | 43       | 58     | 55          | 51        | 60      | 54           | 39       | 69      | 48        |                   |                     | 69           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 55       | 60     |             | 55        | 50      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 54       | 60     | 55          | 59        | 62      | 54           | 52       | 74      | 72        |                   |                     | 69           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 51       | 60     | 55          | 57        | 60      | 53           | 47       | 73      | 71        |                   |                     | 68           |

### 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.

**School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.**

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

The data component showing the lowest performance was the 2023 third grade ELA PM3 indicating a percentage performance of 28% of students performing 3 or above. The influx of new ELL students, increase in class size, computer-based format and absence of a reading coach were contributing factors to this decrease.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline was the 2023 FAST PM 3 ELA subtest with a total decrease of 48 percentage points from grades 3 through 8 compared to 2022 FSA. The influx of new ELL students, increase in class size, computer-based format and absence of a reading coach were contributing factors to this decrease.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the FAST PM 3 state average was grade 3 ELA with a 22 percentage point gap. The influx of new ELL students, increase in class size, computer-based format and absence of a reading coach were contributing factors to this decrease.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is 2023 FAST PM3 grade 6 mathematics with an increase of 20 percentage points when compared to 2022 FSA. A grade 6 instructional review camp with all teachers from the department, a Saturday tutorial program, and strict adherence to the district's pacing guide were new actions taken this year.

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

Data from the EWS indicate that student attendance is a potential area of concern.

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

1. Improve grade 3 ELA proficiency.
2. Increase proficiency in ELA.
3. Establish a school-wide attendance initiative.
4. Implement DI and teacher collaboration with fidelity and follow up regularly with teachers.
5. Implement the Targeted Element of Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning in the area of Reading and Language Arts.

**Area of Focus**

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

**#1. -- 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***

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

According to the 2022-2023 FAST PM3 data, an average of 37% of students in grades 3-8 were proficient in ELA as compared to the state average of 51% and district average of 53%. We will implement the Targeted Element of Differentiated Instruction based on the data and the following identified contributing factors: influx of English Language Learners (ELL students), increase in class size, absence of reading coach, and new Computer Based Testing (CBT) format.

It is a critical need because the average percentage points of proficient students in grades 3-8 in ELA decreased by 8 points. Additionally, the average percentage points of proficient students in grades 3-8 in ELA is 14 percentage points behind the state and 16 percentage points behind the district.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of the Evidenced-Based Differentiated Instruction strategy in ELA, 50% of students in grades 3-8 will make learning gains on the May 2024 ELA FAST PM3.

### Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team will conduct progress monitoring data chats, adjust groups based on current data in real time, and follow-up with regular walkthroughs to ensure quality differentiation is taking place. The Leadership Team will review bi-weekly lesson plans for indication of differentiation. Data Analysis of formative assessments will be reviewed monthly to observe progress. We will create an online tracker to monitor OPM data on a bi-weekly basis. This data will be analyzed during Leadership Team meetings to ensure students are demonstrating growth on remediated standards. Extended learning opportunities will be provided to those students who are not showing growth on OPMs.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Judge (mjjudge@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.)

By implementing the Targeted Element of Differentiation, instructional outcomes will improve. The absence of a reading coach and consistent and strategic ELA instructional coaching in the 2022-2023 school year contributed to the decrease in student achievement. The expected outcome is that 50% of students in grades 3-8 will make learning gains on the May 2024 ELA FAST PM3.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability. Research demonstrates this method benefits a wide range of students.

### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence



**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

Conduct data analysis of formative assessment and create fluid groups based on most current data.

**Person Responsible:** Erica Galeano (egaleano@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

Conduct progress monitoring data chats with teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Michelle Judge (mjjudge@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

Conduct regular walkthroughs to ensure quality instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Michelle Judge (mjjudge@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

**#3. -- 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**

#### #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

##### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

According to the 2022-2023 FAST PM3 data, an average of 37% of students in grades 3-8 were proficient in ELA as compared to the state average of 51% and district average of 53%. We will implement the Targeted Element of Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning based on the data and the following identified contributing factors: influx of English Language Learners (ELL students), increase in class size, absence of reading coach, and new Computer Based Testing (CBT) format.

It is a critical need because the average percentage points of proficient students in grades 3-8 in ELA decreased by 8 points. Additionally, the average percentage points of proficient students in grades 3-8 in ELA is 14 percentage points behind the state and 16 percentage points behind the district.

##### Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of the Evidenced-Based Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning intervention in ELA, 50% of students in grades 3-8 will make learning gains on the May 2024 ELA FAST PM3.

##### Monitoring:

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

The leadership team and teachers will continue Collaborative Planning sessions monthly by department to facilitate professional growth for teachers, disaggregate data, and create differentiated groups. This initiative will be evident by teacher leaders providing support and development to their colleagues in various areas. As well as sharing an understanding of student expectations for standards, curriculum, assessment and instruction.

##### 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.)

By implementing the Targeted Element of Collaborative Planning, instructional outcomes will improve. The absence of a reading coach and consistent and strategic ELA instructional coaching in the 2022-2023 school year contributed to the decrease in student achievement. The expected outcome is that 50% of students in grades 3-8 will make learning gains on the May 2024 ELA FAST PM3.

##### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborative learning is based on the theory that knowledge is a social construct. Collaborative activities are most often based on four principles: (1) the learner or student is the primary focus of instruction; (2) interaction and "doing" are of primary importance; (3) working in groups is an important mode of learning; (4) structured approaches to developing solutions to real-world problems should be incorporated into learning. Collaborative learning can occur peer-to-peer or in larger groups. Peer teaching/learning is a type of collaborative learning that involves students working in pairs or small groups to discuss concepts, or find solutions to problems. It enables learners to take responsibility for reviewing, organizing, and consolidating existing knowledge and material; understanding its basic structure; filling in the gaps; finding

additional meanings; and reformulating knowledge into new conceptual frameworks. Learning from peers increases learning both for the students being helped as well as for those giving the help.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

Schedule monthly collaborative planning meetings.

**Person Responsible:** Michelle Judge (mjjudge@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

Conduct monthly collaborative planning with subject area departments led by instructional coaches, to facilitate professional growth for teachers, disaggregate data, and create fluid DI groups.

**Person Responsible:** Robert Canal (rcanal@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

Conduct weekly collaborative sessions with grade level colleagues to reflect on the implementation of instructional strategies and curriculum. Teachers will share best practices and their individual strengths within the team.

**Person Responsible:** Michelle Judge (mjjudge@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

Conduct administrative walk-throughs during collaborative planning sessions.

**Person Responsible:** Michelle Judge (mjjudge@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

**#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. 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.

During the 2022-2023 school year, there were 121 students whose attendance was below 90%. Based on the data review, our school target is implementing attendance initiatives in order to improve student attendance. Through our data review, we noticed the students who struggle with daily attendance are also the students who are not meeting expectations for proficiency. We recognize the need to tailor our attendance initiatives and improve in making connections with families and the community to ensure attendance is consistently high.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If we successfully target implementing attendance initiatives, our students will receive quality instruction that will contribute to improved student outcomes. With consistent implementation of attendance initiatives, the number of students whose attendance is below 90% will decrease by 3% points as compared to the number of students whose attendance was below 90% in the 2022 -2023 school year.

**Monitoring:**

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

The Leadership Team (LT) will implement the following attendance initiatives: work to connect with families who struggle with attendance, identify the root cause for absences, and create a plan of action to ensure students are able to be present daily. The Leadership Team will provide incentives to encourage regular school attendance. Teachers will monitor their daily attendance and submit that data to the LT on a weekly basis with emphasis on attendance trends. To ensure we are on track to meeting the outcome above, this data will be discussed during data chats with teachers and students, and parental contact will be made when necessary.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Michelle Judge (mjjudge@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.)

Attendance Initiatives will assist in decreasing the number of student absences. The initiatives will provide the LT with a systematic approach to identify attendance issues, remediation, and rewards

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Strategic Attendance Initiative involve close monitoring and reporting of student absences, calls to parents, and more direct measures including home visits, counseling, and referral to outside agencies, as well as incentives for students with perfect attendance.

**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.

Communicate expectations to all stakeholders via school letter, orientations, parent conferences, Open House, school website, and social media platforms.

**Person Responsible:** Michelle Judge (mjjudge@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

Connect to families who struggle with attendance to identify the root cause of absences and create a plan of action to ensure students are able to be present daily.

**Person Responsible:** Lorena Liscano (lliscano@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

Refer families to appropriate agencies to receive needed services.

**Person Responsible:** Lorena Liscano (lliscano@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23 - 9/29/23

**#7. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2022-2023 FAST PM3 data, an average of 37% of students in grades 3-8 were proficient in ELA as compared to the state average of 51% and district average of 53%. We will implement the Targeted Element of Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning based on the data and the following identified contributing factors: influx of English Language Learners (ELL students), increase in class size, absence of reading coach, and new Computer Based Testing (CBT) format.

It is a critical need because the average percentage points of proficient students in grades 3-8 in ELA decreased by 8 points. Additionally, the average percentage points of proficient students in grades 3-8 in ELA is 14 percentage points behind the state and 16 percentage points behind the district.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

With the implementation of the Evidenced-Based Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning intervention in ELA, 50% of students in grades 3-8 will make learning gains on the May 2024 ELA FAST PM3.

**Monitoring:**

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

Administration will meet with instructional coaches monthly for progress checks. The leadership team will conduct regular walkthroughs and data analysis to monitor implementation and progress.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Michelle Judge (mjjudge@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.)

By implementing the Targeted Element of Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning, instructional outcomes will improve. The absence of a reading coach and consistent and strategic ELA instructional coaching in the 2022-2023 school year contributed to the decrease in student achievement. The expected outcome is that 50% of students in grades 3-8 will make learning gains on the May 2024 ELA FAST PM3.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Instructional Support/Coaching is when teachers work together to set a measurable goal to improve instructional outcomes. Coaching Cycles focus on the identified goal and increases the achievement and engagement of every student by bringing out the best performance of every teacher. Coaches use both student-centered and teacher-centered methods to help teachers improve the decisions they make about their instruction.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

The reading coach works with teachers to review data and set a measurable goal to improve instructional outcomes.

**Person Responsible:** Erica Galeano (egaleano@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23-9/29/23

The reading coach models a lesson and debriefs with teacher.

**Person Responsible:** Erica Galeano (egaleano@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23-9/29/23

The reading coach and teachers plan effective lessons based on data analysis.

**Person Responsible:** Erica Galeano (egaleano@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/23-9/29/23

## 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**

To follow are the percentages of students in kindergarten through grade 2, based on 2022-2023 coordinated screening and progress monitoring system data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment: 46% of current grade 1 students ranked in the lowest 35 percentile on the STAR FAST PM 3, and 60% of current grade 2 students ranked in the lowest 35 percentile on the STAR FAST PM 3.

We will implement the Targeted Element of Reading/ELA Intervention based on the data and the following identified contributing factors: influx of English Language Learners (ELL students), increase in class size, absence of reading coach, and new Computer Based Testing (CBT) format. It is a critical need because more than half of the students in grades K-2 are not performing on grade level.

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

To follow are the percentages of students who scored below Level 3 on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria includes each grade that has 50 percent or more



students scoring below Level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment. 54% of current grade 3 students ranked in the lowest 35 percentile on the STAR FAST PM 3; 72% of current grade 4 students scored levels 1 and 2 on the FAST PM 3; and 63% of current grade 5 students scored levels 1 and 2 on the FAST PM 3. We will implement the Targeted Element of Reading/ELA Intervention based on the data and the following identified contributing factors: influx of English Language Learners (ELL students), increase in class size, absence of reading coach, and new Computer Based Testing (CBT) format. It is a critical need because the average percentage points of proficient students in grades 3-5 in ELA decreased by 12 percentage points. Additionally, the average percentage points of proficient students in grades 3-5 in ELA is 16 percentage points behind the state and 17 percentage points behind the district.

### 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 the Evidenced-Based Reading/ELA Intervention strategy in ELA, 50% of students in grades K-2 will make learning gains on the May 2024 ELA STAR FAST PM3.

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

With the implementation of the Evidenced-Based Reading/ELA Intervention strategy in ELA, 50% of students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the May 2024 ELA FAST PM3.

## 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 Leadership Team will conduct regular walkthroughs to ensure quality Intervention is taking place. Data Analysis of assessments will be reviewed monthly to observe progress. We will create an online tracker to monitor OPM data on a bi-weekly basis. This data will be analyzed during Leadership Team meetings to ensure students are demonstrating growth.

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Galeano, Erica, [egaleano@dadeschools.net](mailto:egaleano@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?

Intervention is a strategy used to teach a new skill, build fluency in a skill, or encourage a co-existing skill in new situations or settings.

**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 strategy of intervention can be tailored to accommodate various learning styles and individual needs. Intervention can play a crucial role in closing achievement gaps between students who are performing below grade level in Reading/ELA. These interventions can help bridge the gaps in understanding.

**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           |
|---|---|
| Identify students utilizing the K-5 ELL Student Intervention Decision Tree. | Galeano, Erica,<br>egaleano@dadeschools.net |
| Schedule identified students for small-group intervention.                  | Galeano, Erica,<br>egaleano@dadeschools.net |
| Monitor intervention and student data.                                      | Galeano, Erica,<br>egaleano@dadeschools.net |

## 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.

The SIP is disseminated and reviewed at EESAC, Faculty, Leadership, Grade Level, Department, and PTSA meetings. It is also e-mailed to our faculty and staff and posted on our school's web site (milamk8.org).

**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))

The school regularly communicates with all stakeholders via physical and virtual meetings, e-mails, School Messenger, school website, Schoology, Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, individual teacher communication platforms, and school-wide community events,

**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 II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))**

Milam will strengthen the academic program by implementing the following evidence-based interventions:  
Coaching, Differentiated Instruction, Collaboration, Attendance Monitoring.

**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))**

This plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs.

## 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: -- Select below --:  | \$0.00        |
| 2             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation                              | \$0.00        |
| 3             | III.B. | Area of Focus: -- Select below --:  | \$0.00        |
| 4             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning                       | \$0.00        |
| 5             | III.B. | Area of Focus: -- Select below --:  | \$0.00        |
| 6             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System               | \$0.00        |
| 7             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |   | <b>\$0.00</b> |

**Budget Approval**

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

No