

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Kendale Lakes Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	25
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Kendale Lakes Elementary School

8000 SW 142ND AVE, Miami, FL 33183

<http://kle.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), (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.

Kendale Lakes Elementary School's mission is to provide a productive, secure, learning environment, whereby students will acquire a sense of accomplishment that encourages constant growth, pride, and the desire to reach full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kendale Lakes Elementary School's vision is to provide organizational strategies that reflect quality leadership, commitment to excellence, and self-actualization for all stakeholders.

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
Jaureguizar, Martha	Principal	<p>School leaders play a critical role in school improvement by developing the capabilities of staff in leadership teams to implement and sustain change/improvements. In our school, our leadership team works to develop structures that support evidence-informed learning. Our school leadership team strives to build quality relationships that support achievement, engagement, and well-being. The goal of the school leadership team is to implement school improvement strategies, develop school staff, and empower all stakeholders for the common goal of student achievement while also supporting social-emotional learning goals for students and enabling them to reach their full potential. The administrative team, consisting of Principal, Martha T. Jaureguizar and Assistant Principal, Nancy Cabrera will lead, direct, and monitor the school leadership team members to ensure all members are actively engaged and participating in their supportive school roles. The leadership team will meet quarterly, or as needed, to ensure that all stakeholders are collaborating in the decision making process for our school. The administrative team will coordinate the activities of the leadership team, provide for collaboration with the EESAC committee, and ensure that school improvement goals are implemented effectively and with fidelity through ongoing grade level/faculty meetings as needed.</p>
Cabrera, Nancy	Assistant Principal	<p>The administrative team, consisting of Principal, Martha T. Jaureguizar and Assistant Principal, Nancy Cabrera will lead, direct, and monitor the school leadership team members to ensure all members are actively engaged and participating in their supportive school roles.</p>
Sanchez, Kristine	Instructional Coach	<p>The instructional coach for Reading, Kristine Sanchez, will attend monthly district instructional coach meetings and disseminate information to staff on curriculum strategies and best practices from the Miami-Dade School District academic divisions.</p>
Alvarez, Elena	Behavior Specialist	<p>The Behavior Specialist, Elena Alvarez, will provide support to classrooms with identified students that require behavior interventions and accommodations to fully provide for academic/behavior goals.</p>
Buoncore, Alexander	ELL Compliance Specialist	<p>The ELL Compliance Specialist, will manage the ELL program folders, support teachers, test incoming ELL students, and support identified classrooms.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ceballos, Ivett	School Counselor	The school guidance counselor, Ivett Ceballos, will lead, provide, and support our school's social-emotional learning goals while also supporting the implementation of the school improvement plan school culture goal area and action steps.
Borges, Dayami	Instructional Technology	The instructional technology leader, Dayami Borges, will provide support and guidance to staff for implementation of technology programs as well as fill the role of our school's media specialist.
Mierisch, Ana	Math Coach	The instructional coach for Math, Ms. Mierisch, will attend monthly district instructional coach meetings and disseminate information to staff on curriculum strategies and best practices from the Miami-Dade School District academic divisions.
Jones, Damarys	Science Coach	The instructional coach for Science, Ms. Jones, will attend monthly district instructional coach meetings and disseminate information to staff on curriculum strategies and best practices from the Miami-Dade School District academic divisions.

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 Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) is the sole body responsible for final decision making at the school relating to the implementation of the components of the School Performance Excellence Plan. The EESAC's function is to bring together all stakeholders and involve them in an authentic role in decisions which affect instruction and the delivery of programs. The ESSAC committee must be composed of the principal, teachers, education support employees, students, parents, and business/community representatives. Must be representative of the ethnic, racial, linguistic, disabled, and economic community served by the school. Must have a majority of members who do not work at the school. ESE and ELL stakeholders must be represented with parents when possible. PTA/PTSA representative may be a named member. Adult/vocational programs must be represented. The members are elected as follows: Teachers elect teachers. Parents elect parents. Students elect students. Educational support employees elect educational support employees. Principal appoints business/community representative -- to ensure council diversity. Principal and UTD designated steward are automatic. The EESAC committee along with input from all staff, parents, students, and community stakeholders are invited to participate in the formation of the school improvement plan. Input gathered from stakeholders during Phase I-Data Analysis and Planning is consolidated by the Administrative Team and Synergy Team Planning committee to derive goal areas for the school year. These areas are all encompassing and collaborative with a shared goal of improved student performance and positive

social emotional well-being for all members of the KLE family. During the school year, the goal areas that are set are revisited to determine progress towards goal. The mid-year check provides an opportunity for all stakeholders to give input and review data trends to ensure that action steps are providing for improvement. Updates to the actions steps are provided to ensure that progress towards goal areas is supported. The end-of-year phase provides an opportunity for staff, parents, students, and community stakeholders to reflect on progress, satisfaction of goal areas, areas that still require attention, and new insights and goals for the following 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))

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 Florida Department of Education 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. The SIP will be scripted during Phase I - Data Analysis and Planning during the Synergy summer conference with input garnered from all stakeholders and multiple data sources. Phase II -Implementation of goal areas and action steps will take place August 14, 2023-September 29, 2023. Phase III will consist of a reflection and review during the week of October 2, 2023-October 13, 2023. Phase IV will continue with implementation and a set of additional actions steps used to continue school progress towards goal areas during the period of October 16, 2023-January 19, 2024. During the week of January 22, 2024-January 31, 2024, the mid-year data and progress towards goal area will take place. Schools will conduct an extensive data analysis and present findings to faculty and the ESSAC committee. The last implementation phase will take place, Phase VI-February 1, 2024-May 24, 2024. The school year will conclude with the end-of-year reflection piece and formulation of possible goal areas for the following school year.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	97%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	87%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2020-21: A 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	3	9	8	9	7	15	0	0	0	51	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	2	3	1	1	2	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	2	3	10	0	0	0	17	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	15	29	0	0	0	51	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	11	17	0	0	0	30	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	12	28	18	23	39	0	0	0	128	

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	3	3	4	7	10	19	0	0	0	46

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	10	8	6	7	1	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	8	5	8	15	12	14	0	0	0	62	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	6	6	11	0	0	0	25	
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	5	11	3	0	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	21	12	0	0	0	40	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	11	22	0	0	0	37	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	4	17	31	21	0	0	0	75	

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	2	3	2	4	6	6	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	6	3	8	0	1	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	8	5	8	15	12	14	0	0	0	62	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	6	6	11	0	0	0	25	
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	5	11	3	0	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	21	12	0	0	0	40	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	11	22	0	0	0	37	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	4	17	31	21	0	0	0	75	

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	2	3	2	4	6	6	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	6	3	8	0	1	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

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

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*	70			69			81		
ELA Learning Gains	75			55			72		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54			37			63		
Math Achievement*	78			72			89		
Math Learning Gains	81			64			85		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	80			73			68		
Science Achievement*	65			70			76		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	71			61			84		

* 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

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	574
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	56			
ELL	73			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	71			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	82			
FRL	71			

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)

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	70	75	54	78	81	80	65					71
SWD	41	48	41	60	72	68	46					69

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
ELL	67	74	57	77	83	92	61					71
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	70	75	51	77	80	78	66					72
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	73			91								
FRL	68	75	55	77	82	82	60					70

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	69	55	37	72	64	73	70					61
SWD	43	30	27	63	78	83	48					33
ELL	66	59	50	75	65	71	71					61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	69	53	37	72	63	73	69					61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	67	51	38	72	63	70	66					61

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	81	72	63	89	85	68	76					84
SWD	66	63	43	79	72	53	64					69
ELL	78	73	69	89	86	69	76					84
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK												
HSP	81	72	65	89	85	66	78					83
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	90			100								
FRL	80	71	60	91	86	72	75					83

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.

ELA grade 4 students had a 61% proficiency rate. Although this proficiency rate exceeds that of the district and state which were at 58% for grade 4, this was our lowest performing data point across all academic achievement categories measured for elementary schools.

Contributing factors for this data component includes our diverse student demographics inclusive of over 80% ED, over 50% ELL and approximately 20% SPED. There was also an influx of several new students that were new to the country, and were classified as students eligible for our ESOL program with levels 1 and 2 for instructional purposes.

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

Upon a close review of the FAST results for Reading and Mathematics and FCAT Science, the data reveals that overall the trends reflect overall increase in student performance when compared to the previous school year assessment results. There is a 5 percentage point decrease in ELA proficiency when comparing 2022 to 2023 with 2022 having a proficiency of 70 as compared to 2023 which is at 65. Mathematics and Science continues to be a strong area for our school as compared to ELA. There are several factors which contributed to ELA being a watch area. Our school continues to have a large ELL population as well as a large influx of ELL students entering from outside the country. Additionally, our school qualifies as Title I and because of this, some of our KLE families require parent academy trainings, technology assistance, and school counselor support in order to support struggling students

and families ongoing needs. Lastly, support of ELA Florida State Standards continues to be an area where rigorous and abundant support from both instructional coaches and professional development is required to support teachers to have effective instructional delivery in this curriculum area.

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.

A targeted area for this school year will be to address the lowest performing area of grade 4 ELA which had the lowest performance at 61% proficiency when compared to the state value of 58% and the district also at 58%. An increased review of technology reports and state standard mastery reports from i-Ready may be beneficial to increasing the performance in the category. Additionally, students in this grade level with a score of level 1 or a level 2, will be looked at more closely to ensure that the reading intervention program is delivered with maximum effectiveness. Examining Horizons standards mastery reports and usage will be helpful to ensure progress in this area. Lastly, grade 4 ESOL students that continue to struggle to make adequate progress and performance would benefit from targeted skill focused small group instruction in both the teacher led centers and teacher assigned lessons in i-Ready.

In an effort to continue the high performance in all areas of ELA, Mathematics, and Science, a concerted effort will be made to continue our school's STEAM emphasized curriculum in all content areas, use intervention personnel and programs to support our lowest performing subgroups, continue ARC and MTSS meetings to address attendance and performance concerns, provide meaningful professional development and instructional coach support to our staff and faculty.

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

Math grade 5 had the strongest proficiency rate at 87%. We were able to continue incorporating our departmentalized master schedule with teachers that are highly talented in their particular subject areas. Additionally, due to our varied instructional programs, homogeneous grouping has enabled us to provide valuable support services for our classrooms serving students receiving specialized services: SPED, ELL, TEAM, and Gifted. As needed teachers are also working in co-teaching or support facilitation settings in order to optimize instructional delivery, student engagement and/or intervention services where programmatically applicable.

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

Overall ELA is a priority for our school despite having a proficiency level that exceeds the district and state average. Given the diverse needs of our most fragile students, many of which are ED, ELL and/or SPED.

Science proficiency for grade 5 was at 69%. Although this is an increase from 65%, this data is an area that has a great opportunity for overall improvement.

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

School Culture
Attendance, Punctuality, Excused Early Rates
Common Planning/Vertical Articulation
Instructional Practices
Progress Monitoring

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 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 2023 FAST PM3 data, 71% of 3rd grade students were proficient in Math as compared to the state average of 59% and district average of 63%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: rigorous Math State of Florida BEST standards, teacher knowledge of Math standards instructional delivery, and high number of level 1 FAST scoring students, we will implement the Targeted Element of Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Instructional Support and Coaching, an additional 1% (for a total of 72%) of the third grade students will score at grade level or above in the area of Mathematics as evidenced by the FAST PM3 Math assessment by June, 2024.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team along with the administrative team will monitor this area of focus by conducting walkthroughs and reviewing the instructional coaching logs to ensure that quality instruction and Instructional Support and Coaching is implemented with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Martha Jaureguizar (pr2651@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.)

Within the Targeted Element of Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning, our school will focus on the Evidence-based Intervention of Instructional Support Coaching. 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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Instructional Support/Coaching strategies are approaches used in education to enhance the skills and effectiveness of teachers through targeted guidance and feedback. These strategies are designed to help teachers improve their instructional practices, ultimately leading to better student learning outcomes. Instructional support coaching involves a collaborative and ongoing process where a coach works closely with teachers to identify areas for improvement, set goals, and provide personalized support. The goal will be to improve student performance as it relates to the mastery of Florida State Math Standards. Instructional support coaching strategies aim to empower teachers, promote continuous improvement, and ultimately enhance student learning outcomes. By providing personalized guidance, feedback, and resources, instructional support coaches play a crucial role in helping teachers become more effective educators.

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.

8/22/23-9/1/23- Provide Professional Development for teachers on effective implementation of Instructional Support Coaching during grade level meetings. The instructional lead coach will present strategies and protocols that were presented during the Jim Knight Coaching workshop during Synergy. The coaching models and protocols are designed to close the student achievement gap and accelerate learning by helping teachers implement evidence-based instructional practices with fidelity. According to the identified Math data areas of concern, the instructional coaching will be focused on identifying the Florida State Standards for Math for grade 3-5 as well as future horizontal team planning. The evidence of the completion of the action step will be the grade level meeting minutes and instructional coach logs.

Person Responsible: Kristine Sanchez (kristinesanchez@dadeschools.net)

9/4/23-9/15/23- Teachers will attend weekly collaborative grade level meetings and use the Jim Knight protocols, dialogues, and support strategies to provide for peer coaching and sharing of ideas during grade level team meetings. Teachers will share and review the identified Math Florida State Standards during grade level meetings and determine next steps for effective instruction. The evidence of the completion of the action step will be the grade level meeting minutes.

Person Responsible: Martha Jaureguizar (pr2651@dadeschools.net)

9/18/23-9/29/23- The Instructional Coach that participated in the Jim Knight Coaching Workshop will revisit with teachers during grade level meetings to answer questions, provided continued direction, and determine next steps and possible future professional development for effective Instructional Support Coaching. Future professional development will focus on Math Florida State Standards that still need to be addressed when reviewing the Math data from FAST PM1. The evidence of the completion of the action step will be grade level meeting minutes and instructional coach logs.

Person Responsible: Kristine Sanchez (kristinesanchez@dadeschools.net)

#2. 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 2023 FCAT NGSSS Science, 69% of 5th grade students were proficient in Science as compared to the state average of 51% and district average of 50%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: high number of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students, teacher knowledge of Florida State Science Standards, and mastery and building of Science State Standards progression through grade levels our school selected the researched based Lesson Study.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Lesson Study, an additional 1% (for a total of 70%) of the fifth grade students will score at grade level or above in the area of Science as evidenced by the 2024 FCAT NGSSS.

Monitoring:

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

The Administrative Team will conduct quarterly data chats, lesson plan review, and regular walkthroughs to ensure that Lesson Study Team members are meeting to review Science state standards, STEAM 5.0 lesson rubrics, and implementing weekly Science labs that meet grade level expectations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Martha Jaureguizar (pr2651@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.)

Within the Targeted Element of Collaborative Planning, our school will focus on the Evidence-based Intervention of Lesson Planning. Lesson Study is a form of classroom inquiry in which several teachers collaboratively plan, teach, observe, revise, and share the results of a single class lesson. In a Lesson Study, teachers carefully explore how student learning, thinking, and behavior change as a result of the lesson. The practice of Lesson Study can lead to instructional improvement as teachers become more knowledgeable about how their students learn and think and how instruction affects student thinking. The Lesson Study focuses on student outcomes rather than what the teacher is doing.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The primary objective of this school improvement initiative is to elevate student engagement and mastery in classroom learning by implementing a robust system of collaborative Lesson Study across our school in Florida. Through ongoing cycles of Lesson Study, educators will collaboratively design, implement, and refine instructional strategies to create dynamic and effective learning experiences for all students. By effectively implementing collaborative Lesson Study practices, our school aims to not only elevate instructional quality but also to create a vibrant learning community that prioritizes student engagement, mastery, and holistic development. Through this initiative, we aspire to equip our students with the skills, knowledge, and motivation needed to excel academically and thrive in an ever-evolving world.

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.

8/15/2023- Provide Professional Development for teachers on effective implementation of Lesson Study as it relates to STEAM and Florida State Science Standards. As a result, teachers will identify STEAM 5.0 Lessons and be able to locate resources for instructing and implementing Science labs that are aligned with grade level expectations, pacing guides, and Florida State Standards. The evidence for the completion of this action step will be the professional development day sign-in sheet and agenda.

Person Responsible: Kristine Sanchez (kristinesanchez@dadeschools.net)

8/16/23-9/25/23- Teachers will develop lesson plans and implement Science labs that are aligned with grade level appropriate Science expectations, aligned with MDCPS Science lesson plans, and provide for Science labs that are considered a 5.0 Science lab. The evidence for the completion of this action step will be the teacher Science lessons plans, lab worksheets, and administrator walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Martha Jaureguizar (pr2651@dadeschools.net)

9/25/23-9/29/23- The Professional Development Liaison will meet in grade level meetings to gather input from teachers that may require additional support to effectively implement rigorous Science lessons and 5.0 STEAM labs. The Professional Development liaison will use this information to design the next professional development day that will be geared towards STEAM and Florida State Science Standards. The evidence for the completion of this action step will be the grade level meeting minutes, handouts, agenda, and Professional Development Liaison logs.

Person Responsible: Kristine Sanchez (kristinesanchez@dadeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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 2023 FAST ELA PM3 data, 61% of 4th grade students were proficient in ELA as compared to the state average of 58% and district average of 58%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: high number of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students, large influx of ESOL students new to the country, and student ability to mastery grade level expectations, we will implement the Targeted Element of Academic Vocabulary Instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Academic Vocabulary Instruction, an additional 2% (for a total of 63%) of 4th grade students will score at grade level or above in area of ELA. as evidenced by the 2024 FAST ELA PM3.

Monitoring:

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

The Administrative Team will conduct quarterly data chats, regular walkthroughs, and review lesson plans to ensure that Academic Vocabulary Instruction is implemented with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Martha Jaureguizar (pr2651@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.)

Within the Targeted Element of Benchmark Aligned Instruction, our school will focus on the Evidence-based Intervention of: Academic Vocabulary Instruction. Evidence-based strategies for Academic Vocabulary Instruction are approaches to teaching vocabulary that are supported by research and have been shown to be effective in improving students' understanding and use of academic language. These strategies are particularly important because academic vocabulary encompasses the specialized words and phrases that are commonly found in textbooks, academic articles, and other educational materials. Mastering academic vocabulary is crucial for students to excel in various subjects and perform well in academic tasks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective Academic Vocabulary Instruction is an ongoing process that requires patience and consistency. Different strategies may work better for different students and age groups, so educators should adapt their approach based on the needs of their students. The goal of academic vocabulary instruction is to equip students with the specific language and terminology necessary to understand and engage with academic content across various subjects and disciplines. Academic vocabulary includes words and phrases that are commonly used in textbooks, lectures, research papers, and academic discussions. These terms are often more complex and specialized than everyday language and play a crucial role in students' ability to comprehend and communicate effectively within educational settings.

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.

8/21/23-9/1/23- The Literacy Coach will provide professional development to teachers during grade levels meetings on Academic Vocabulary Instruction. Vocabulary instructional strategies, MDCPS ELA pacing guides, MDCPS Vocabulary Benchmark Planning Cards, McGraw-Hill resources, and i-Ready Toolbox will be covered during the presentations. The expected evidence that the action step has been completed will be the coaching logs, grade level meeting minutes, agendas, handouts, and sign-in sheets.

Person Responsible: Kristine Sanchez (kristinesanchez@dadeschools.net)

9/5/23-9/22/23-Teachers will develop and implement lesson plans that include robust and rigorous vocabulary instruction using the resources and strategies presented by the Literacy Instructional Coach. Teachers' instructional delivery and course content will be sensitive to a wide variety of learners and will address these needs through small group skill focused lessons, differentiated instruction, and whole group direct vocabulary instruction. The expected evidence that the action step has been completed will be the teacher lesson plans and administrator walkthroughs and observations.

Person Responsible: Martha Jaureguizar (pr2651@dadeschools.net)

8/25/23-9/29/23- The Instructional Literacy Coach will revisit with teachers during grade level planning sessions to gather input regarding effective and successful implementation of rigorous Academic Vocabulary Instruction. The Literacy Coach will identify, using teacher input, areas of additional support that are needed to fully implement the action step and plan for upcoming professional development or coaching and modeling sessions on the use of Academic Vocabulary Instruction. The expected evidence that the action step has been completed will be the Literacy Coach's logs and grade level meeting minutes.

Person Responsible: Kristine Sanchez (kristinesanchez@dadeschools.net)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to the 2023 EWS (Early Warning Systems) dashboard in Power BI, 46 students are identified as having more than two indicators of: attendance below 90%, one or more suspensions, course failure in ELA, course failure in Math, level 1 on ELA PM3, level 1 on Math PM3, and/ or substantial reading deficiencies. Compared to our school EWS indicators of 2 or more for 2022, our school has decreased the number from 54 in 2022 to 46 in 2023. Although this area has shown improvement, this area continues to be a watch area as our desired outcome is to significantly reduced the number of students that fall in this category. The contributing factors for students that fall into this range are poor economic status, ELL students new to the country, students that need to attend reading intervention, retained students, and students that may need to participate in the the RtI (Response to Intervention) program to identify learning deficiencies. In an effort to reduce the number of students that fall within the categories within the Early Warning Systems indicators, our school will focus this year on the research based Collective Efficacy.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of collective efficacy, the goal will be to decrease the amount of students falling within the EWS two or more indicators of category by 10 percentage points by June 2024 EWS indicator chart located in Power BI. The goal will be to decrease the amount of students from 46 students to 42 students.

Monitoring:

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

The Administrative Team will monitor data from from the EWS data categories of several different sources such as attendance records, grades, standardized test scores, classroom assessments, behavior incidents, and even socio-economic factors that may lead to risk factors that contribute to poor student progress. Monitoring early warning systems involves collecting and analyzing various data points to identify patterns and trends that might indicate a student is struggling. The data sources will be monitored quarterly by the Administrative Team and identified students will be placed in appropriate program support/intervention, referred to the MTSS Team, and/or school counselor for follow-up.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Martha Jaureguizar (pr2651@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.)

Within the Targeted Element of Culture and Environment, our school will focus on the Evidence-based Intervention of Collective Efficacy. The targeted intervention of collective efficacy for a positive school culture revolves around enhancing the shared belief among teachers and staff that they have the ability to positively influence student outcomes and improve the overall learning environment. Collective efficacy refers to the belief that, through their collaborative efforts, educators can make a difference in student achievement and well-being, regardless of individual student backgrounds or challenges.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The intervention is aimed at fostering a sense of shared responsibility and empowerment within the school community. When educators believe that their combined actions can lead to successful outcomes, they are more likely to engage in effective teaching practices, collaborate with colleagues, and work towards

common goals. By targeting collective efficacy as an intervention strategy, schools can create a culture of shared purpose, collaboration, and empowerment. This contributes to a positive school climate where students thrive, teachers feel motivated and supported, and overall educational outcomes improve.

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.

8/14/23-8/25/2023- The Assistant Principal will review the EWS (Early Warning Systems indicators dashboard) and compare and identify areas of greatest need and focus for the school year using the Power BI dashboard. The expected evidence that the action step has been completed will be the reports and data charts from Power BI.

Person Responsible: Nancy Cabrera (ncabreran@dadeschools.net)

8/28/23-9/1/23-The Assistant Principal and Literacy Coach will have data chats per grade level to review the results from the EWS dashboard and identify students in each grade level that have two or more indicators. The Literacy Coach will meet with the teachers and the school counselor of the identified students to determine an action plan for the school year to ensure student academic success and provide for social-emotional needs as appropriate. The School Counselor will develop the classroom visitation schedule and will focus the classroom presentations on the EWS indicators. Consistent school attendance is a key factor in ensuring that students have the opportunity to fully engage with their education, build essential skills, and establish a strong foundation for future success in both academic and personal endeavors. The expected evidence that the action step has been completed will be the data chat charts, teacher coaching logs, school counselor logs, and school counselor schedule of classroom visits.

Person Responsible: Nancy Cabrera (ncabreran@dadeschools.net)

9/5/23-9/29/23- The School Counselor will implement the classroom visit and presentation schedule. In order to create and promote a school culture of positivity where students take ownership of attendance, learning goals, and achievement while also working towards a positive growth mindset, the school counselor will create a classroom visitation schedule. The school counselor will implement her school-wide schedule and incorporate various classroom activities with appropriate materials to support social emotional learning with a focus on building character traits, student attendance, and punctuality. The focus of the counselor's lessons will be to provide students with social and emotional learning activities while also helping students to understand the importance of good school attendance, and the behaviors aligned with our MDCPS Core Values. The counselor's schedule and counselor logs will serve as the documentation that the implementation step has been completed.

Person Responsible: Ivett Ceballos (iceballos@dadeschools.net)

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).

N/A

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

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

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

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

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?

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****Title I Requirements****Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

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

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

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

N/A

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

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

N/A

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

S/A

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

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

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: Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$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.

Yes