

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# ARCOLA LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL



2024-25 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# Table of Contents

SIP Authority ..... 1

I. School Information ..... 3

    A. School Mission and Vision ..... 3

    B. School Leadership Team ..... 3

    C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring ..... 6

    D. Demographic Data ..... 7

    E. Early Warning Systems ..... 8

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review ..... 11

    A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison ..... 12

    B. ESSA School-Level Data Review ..... 13

    C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review ..... 14

    D. Accountability Components by Subgroup ..... 17

    E. Grade Level Data Review ..... 20

III. Planning for Improvement ..... 21

IV. Positive Culture and Environment ..... 30

V. Title I Requirements (optional) ..... 33

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review ..... 37

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus ..... 38

## School Board Approval

This plan has not yet been approved by the Dade County School Board.

## 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:

| <b>ADDITIONAL TARGET SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT (ATSI)</b>   |
|---|
| A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.   |
| <b>TARGETED SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT (TSI)</b>   |
| A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.  |
| <b>COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT (CSI)</b>  |
| <p>A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;</li> <li>2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;</li> <li>3. Have a school grade of D or F; or</li> <li>4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.</li> </ol> |

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 parents), 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://cims2.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)  |                      |
| I.E: Early Warning System  | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)                                    | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II.A-E: Data Review  |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| III.A: Data Analysis/Reflection                                    | ESSA 1114(b)(6)   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III.B, IV: Area(s) of Focus  | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)                                       |                      |
| V: 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. The printed version in CIMS represents the SIP as of the "Printed" date listed in the footer.

# I. School Information

## A. School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement**

---

Our mission is to be the beacon of educational excellence. We empower our diverse student population to become effective leaders within the global 21st century. Through equitable access of technology and education, we encourage a positive blended learning climate. Teachers and students are encouraged to reach their full potential in the learning process with reliable solutions by providing a multi-tiered education. We are committed to the growth of all stakeholders through educating our students, families and community members.

**Provide the school's vision statement**

---

We aim to provide the highest quality education so that our students become accomplished individuals and exemplary citizens.

## B. School Leadership Team

**School Leadership Team**

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

**Leadership Team Member #1**

**Employee's Name**

Ellis, Yolanda

**Position Title**

Principal

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

---

The principal provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. Data is utilized to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Ms. Ellis establishes high expectations for all students, and ensures that the school-based team is implementing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS).

**Leadership Team Member #2**

**Employee's Name**

Hill, Leasha

**Position Title**

Assistant Principal

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

---

The Assistant Principal works in collaboration with the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. Ms. Hill ensures fidelity of the MTSS monitoring by evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development with faculty needs. Monitoring classroom instruction utilizing the Framework for Effective Instruction through daily walk-throughs focusing on instructional delivery and student work products. Assistant Principal coordinates the implementation of all District and State mandated assessments to ensure students have all required accommodations and resources.

**Leadership Team Member #3****Employee's Name**

Hill, Kennise

**Position Title**

Reading Coach

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

---

The Reading Coach provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. The Reading Coach utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success. The Reading Coach conducts collaborative planning sessions, analyzes student data, and provides teachers with professional development on how to effectively select and utilize standard-aligned classroom resources.

**Leadership Team Member #4****Employee's Name**

Clarke, Ginger

**Position Title**

School Counselor

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

---

The counselor is an integral part of the MTSS team that uses data-based problem-solving to integrate academic and behavioral instruction and intervention. She provides support to individuals and small groups of students.

**Leadership Team Member #5**

**Employee's Name**

Rutledge, Adriana

**Position Title**

ESE Specialist

**Job Duties and Responsibilities**

---

The ESE teacher provides support to teachers to ensure that students with disabilities demonstrate increased participation and performance in the standard or access curriculum statewide assessments and school site accountability systems.

## C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring

### 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. (ESEA 1114(b)(2))

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

---

Stakeholder involvement in the development of a school improvement plan includes engaging various groups such as teachers, students, parents, administrators, and community members. They will contribute input, ideas, and feedback to create a comprehensive plan. This collaborative process ensures that the plan addresses the diverse needs and goals of the school community, leading to more effective strategies and a sense of ownership among stakeholders. To engage parents and community members we send out weekly Class Dojo announcements, where parents have the ability to add comments or suggestions. Teachers and other staff members are involved in the process through monthly faculty meetings where they share Best Practices designed to foster improvement in student achievement.

### 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 academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESEA 1114(b)(3))

---

The school improvement plan will be regularly monitored by the school leadership team through scheduled weekly walk-throughs with a focus on student product reviews, data-chats, and feedback sessions. The school leadership team will track the implementation of strategies, assess whether goals are being met, and make adjustments as needed to ensure continuous improvement during the school leadership team weekly meetings. This process involves collaboration among team members, utilizing performance data, and maintaining open communication with staff and stakeholders through quarterly parent data chats and EESAC meetings.



## D. Demographic Data

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2024-25 STATUS</b><br>(PER MSID FILE)   | <b>ACTIVE</b>   |
| <b>SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED</b><br>(PER MSID FILE)  | <b>ELEMENTARY<br/>PK-5</b>  |
| <b>PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE</b><br>(PER MSID FILE)   | <b>K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION</b>   |
| <b>2023-24 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS</b>   | <b>YES</b>  |
| <b>2023-24 MINORITY RATE</b>   | <b>98.2%</b>  |
| <b>2023-24 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE</b>   | <b>100.0%</b>   |
| <b>CHARTER SCHOOL</b>  | <b>NO</b>   |
| <b>RAISE SCHOOL</b>  | <b>YES</b>  |
| <b>2023-24 ESSA IDENTIFICATION</b><br>*UPDATED AS OF 7/25/2024   | <b>N/A</b>  |
| <b>ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)</b>  |   |
| <b>2023-24 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED</b><br>(SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS)<br>(SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK) | <b>STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD)<br/>ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL)<br/>BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK)<br/>HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP)<br/>ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)</b> |
| <b>SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY</b><br><i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>   | <b>2023-24: A<br/>2022-23: B*<br/>2021-22: C<br/>2020-21:<br/>2019-20: C</b>  |

## E. Early Warning Systems

### 1. Grades K-8

#### Current Year 2024-25

Using 2023-24 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 school days  | 0           | 14 | 8  | 21 | 14 | 10 |   |   |   | 67    |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1  | 3  |   |   |   | 5     |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 0  | 4  | 17 | 7  | 0  |   |   |   | 28    |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0  | 8  | 15 | 4  | 0  |   |   |   | 27    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 22 | 17 | 18 |   |   |   | 57    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 6  | 10 | 11 |   |   |   | 27    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3) | 0           | 13 | 35 | 61 |    |    |   |   |   | 109   |
| Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)          | 0           | 7  | 7  | 13 | 4  |    |   |   |   | 31    |

#### Current Year 2024-25

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           | 7 | 14 | 39 | 24 | 21 |   |   |   | 105   |

#### Current Year 2024-25

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

| INDICATOR                           | GRADE LEVEL |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained students: current year     | 0           | 0 | 1 | 24 | 0 | 0 |   |   |   | 25    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 6  | 1 | 0 |   |   |   | 7     |

**Prior Year (2023-24) As Last 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 school days  |             | 33 | 19 | 20 | 13 | 24 |   |   |   | 109   |
| One or more suspensions   |             |    |    |    |    | 2  |   |   |   | 2     |
| Course failure in ELA   |             | 5  | 24 | 16 | 16 | 1  |   |   |   | 62    |
| Course failure in Math  |             | 4  | 15 | 9  | 3  | 4  |   |   |   | 35    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   |             |    |    | 13 | 17 | 21 |   |   |   | 51    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  |             |    |    | 11 | 13 | 28 |   |   |   | 52    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3) |             | 4  | 32 | 44 |    |    |   |   |   | 134   |

**Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)**

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 |             | 5 | 19 | 18 | 19 | 26 |   |   |   | 87    |

**Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)**

The number of students retained:

| INDICATOR                           | GRADE LEVEL |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained students: current year     |             | 5 | 6 | 14 |   |   |   |   |   | 25    |
| Students retained two or more times |             | 1 |   |    | 2 | 1 |   |   |   | 4     |

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

## **II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))**

## A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

Data for 2023-24 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

| ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT       | 2024   |           |        | 2023   |           |        | 2022** |           |        |
|--------------------------------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|
|                                | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE† |
| ELA Achievement *              | 49     | 63        | 57     | 53     | 60        | 53     | 43     | 62        | 56     |
| ELA Grade 3 Achievement **     | 37     | 63        | 58     | 60     | 60        | 53     |        |           |        |
| ELA Learning Gains             | 64     | 64        | 60     |        |           |        | 52     |           |        |
| ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%  | 87     | 62        | 57     |        |           |        | 57     |           |        |
| Math Achievement *             | 65     | 69        | 62     | 57     | 66        | 59     | 48     | 58        | 50     |
| Math Learning Gains            | 74     | 65        | 62     |        |           |        | 47     |           |        |
| Math Learning Gains Lowest 25% | 88     | 58        | 52     |        |           |        | 63     |           |        |
| Science Achievement *          | 50     | 61        | 57     | 41     | 58        | 54     | 27     | 64        | 59     |
| Social Studies Achievement *   |        |           |        |        |           |        |        | 71        | 64     |
| Graduation Rate                |        |           |        |        |           |        |        | 53        | 50     |
| Middle School Acceleration     |        |           |        |        |           |        |        | 63        | 52     |
| College and Career Readiness   |        |           |        |        |           |        |        |           | 80     |
| ELP Progress                   | 69     | 64        | 61     | 39     | 63        | 59     | 53     |           |        |

\*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.

\*\*Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2023-24 ESSA FPPI                            |      |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)             | N/A  |
| OVERALL FPPI – All Students                  | 65%  |
| OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students        | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0    |
| Total Points Earned for the FPPI             | 583  |
| Total Components for the FPPI                | 9    |
| Percent Tested                               | 100% |
| Graduation Rate                              |      |

| ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY |         |         |         |          |         |         |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|
| 2023-24                   | 2022-23 | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20* | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
| 65%                       | 53%     | 49%     | 47%     |          | 51%     | 67%     |

\* Pursuant to Florida Department of Education Emergency Order No. 2020-EO-1 (PDF), spring K-12 statewide assessment test administrations for the 2019-20 school year were canceled and accountability measures reliant on such data were not calculated for the 2019-20 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

## C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

### 2023-24 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% |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| Students With Disabilities          | 73%                             | No                 |   |   |
| English Language Learners           | 62%                             | No                 |   |   |
| Black/African American Students     | 67%                             | No                 |   |   |
| Hispanic Students                   | 61%                             | No                 |   |   |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 64%                             | No                 |   |   |

### 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA SUBGROUP              | FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX | SUBGROUP BELOW 41% | NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41% | NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32% |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| Students With Disabilities | 42%                             | No                 |   |   |
| English Language Learners  | 39%                             | Yes                | 1   |   |



## 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA SUBGROUP                       | FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX | SUBGROUP BELOW 41% | NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41% | NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32% |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| Black/African American Students     | 54%                             | No                 |   |   |
| Hispanic Students                   | 49%                             | No                 |   |   |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 56%                             | No                 |   |   |

## 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% |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| Students With Disabilities      | 49%                             | No                 |   |   |
| English Language Learners       | 45%                             | No                 |   |   |
| Native American Students        |                                 |                    |   |   |
| Asian Students                  |                                 |                    |   |   |
| Black/African American Students | 49%                             | No                 |   |   |

| 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% |
| Hispanic Students                   | 47%                             | No                 |   |   |
| Multiracial Students                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| Pacific Islander Students           |                                 |                    |   |   |
| White Students                      |                                 |                    |   |   |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 49%                             | No                 |   |   |

D. 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)

| 2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |             |                        |           |                |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                         |                 |
|--|-------------|------------------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
|  | ELA<br>ACH. | GRADE<br>3 ELA<br>ACH. | ELA<br>LG | ELA LG<br>L25% | MATH<br>ACH. | MATH<br>LG | MATH<br>LG<br>L25% | SCI<br>ACH. | SS<br>ACH. | MS<br>ACCEL. | GRAD<br>RATE<br>2022-23 | C&C<br>ACCEL<br>2022-23 | ELP<br>PROGRESS |
| All Students                                   | 49%         | 37%                    | 64%       | 87%            | 65%          | 74%        | 88%                | 50%         |            |              |                         |                         | 69%             |
| Students With<br>Disabilities                  | 69%         | 54%                    | 94%       | 100%           | 51%          | 71%        | 89%                | 54%         |            |              |                         |                         | 74%             |
| English<br>Language<br>Learners                | 39%         | 22%                    | 63%       | 83%            | 63%          | 87%        | 91%                | 43%         |            |              |                         |                         | 69%             |
| Black/African<br>American<br>Students          | 50%         | 45%                    | 66%       | 89%            | 66%          | 79%        | 89%                | 50%         |            |              |                         |                         |                 |
| Hispanic<br>Students                           | 47%         | 22%                    | 63%       | 83%            | 62%          | 67%        | 85%                | 53%         |            |              |                         |                         | 68%             |
| Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students      | 49%         | 39%                    | 63%       | 90%            | 63%          | 72%        | 87%                | 45%         |            |              |                         |                         | 71%             |

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |             |                        |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                         |                 |
|--|-------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
|  | ELA<br>ACH. | GRADE<br>3 ELA<br>ACH. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | MATH<br>ACH. | MATH<br>LG | MATH<br>LG<br>L25% | SCI<br>ACH. | SS<br>ACH. | MS<br>ACCEL. | GRAD<br>RATE<br>2021-22 | C&C<br>ACCEL<br>2021-22 | ELP<br>PROGRESS |
| All Students                                   | 53%         | 60%                    |           |                   | 57%          |            |                    | 41%         |            |              |                         |                         | 39%             |
| Students With<br>Disabilities                  | 42%         | 48%                    |           |                   | 44%          |            |                    | 43%         |            |              |                         |                         | 35%             |
| English<br>Language<br>Learners                | 41%         | 29%                    |           |                   | 50%          |            |                    | 24%         |            |              |                         |                         | 52%             |
| Black/African<br>American<br>Students          | 53%         | 63%                    |           |                   | 58%          |            |                    | 47%         |            |              |                         |                         | 50%             |
| Hispanic<br>Students                           | 53%         | 56%                    |           |                   | 57%          |            |                    | 28%         |            |              |                         |                         | 53%             |
| Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students      | 56%         | 66%                    |           |                   | 59%          |            |                    | 45%         |            |              |                         |                         | 55%             |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |                  |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                   |              |
|--|----------|------------------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|
|  | ELA ACH. | GRADE 3 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                                   | 43%      |                  | 52%    | 57%         | 48%       | 47%     | 63%          | 27%      |         |           |                   |                   | 53%          |
| Students With Disabilities                     | 39%      |                  | 47%    | 47%         | 56%       | 61%     | 58%          | 44%      |         |           |                   |                   | 40%          |
| English Language Learners                      | 36%      |                  | 42%    | 43%         | 39%       | 56%     | 63%          | 27%      |         |           |                   |                   | 53%          |
| Native American Students                       |          |                  |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| Asian Students                                 |          |                  |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| Black/African American Students                | 44%      |                  | 55%    | 57%         | 51%       | 45%     | 63%          | 29%      |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| Hispanic Students                              | 43%      |                  | 46%    | 56%         | 42%       | 51%     | 63%          | 24%      |         |           |                   |                   | 51%          |
| Multiracial Students                           |          |                  |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| Pacific Islander Students                      |          |                  |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| White Students                                 |          |                  |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                   |              |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students            | 44%      |                  | 52%    | 56%         | 48%       | 47%     | 62%          | 28%      |         |           |                   |                   | 54%          |

## E. 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.

| 2023-24 SPRING |       |        |          |                   |       |                |
|----------------|-------|--------|----------|-------------------|-------|----------------|
| SUBJECT        | GRADE | SCHOOL | DISTRICT | SCHOOL - DISTRICT | STATE | SCHOOL - STATE |
| Ela            | 3     | 35%    | 56%      | -21%              | 55%   | -20%           |
| Ela            | 4     | 56%    | 55%      | 1%                | 53%   | 3%             |
| Ela            | 5     | 50%    | 56%      | -6%               | 55%   | -5%            |
| Math           | 3     | 58%    | 65%      | -7%               | 60%   | -2%            |
| Math           | 4     | 66%    | 62%      | 4%                | 58%   | 8%             |
| Math           | 5     | 66%    | 59%      | 7%                | 56%   | 10%            |
| Science        | 5     | 48%    | 53%      | -5%               | 53%   | -5%            |

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

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

##### **Most Improvement**

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

---

According to FAST PM3 data improvement was shown in all subject categories in grades 3-5 with our L25 and students making learning gains. The proficiency level in ELA was sustained with 47%. There was an increase of 12 percentage points in Math from 51% to 63%. Science increased 19 percentage point from 29% to 48%. There was an overall increase of 28 percentage points in ELA proficiency for primary students from 11% to 39%. Also, in the area of Math there was an overall increase of 33 percentage points for primary students from 37% to 70%.

The greatest increase was Science, action steps that led to the increase in proficiency were additional district support, targeted Saturday Science Club, STEAM Labs and activities, and parental involvement in afterschool experiments, which increased students' interest in science. Other researched based strategies were also implemented at our school to improve in these areas, including data-driven instruction, differentiated instruction, extended learning opportunities, standards-based collaborative planning, ELA intervention, and professional development opportunities.

##### **Lowest Performance**

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

---

According to the FAST PM3 ELA data, Grade 3 had one of the lowest performances last school year. In grade 3, 37% of students were proficient. There was a decrease of 14 percentage points in third grade ELA from 49% to 35%. One reason for last year's low performance is that many students entered the current grade level one or more grades behind. Particularly in grade 3, the majority of students were ELLs and had yet to undergo the MTSS process. In addition, novice teachers were unfamiliar with the content and grade level.

##### **Greatest Decline**

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

---

According to our FSA/FAST three year trend data the greatest decline from the previous year was a 14 percentage point decrease in 3rd grade ELA on the 2023-2024 FAST state assessment as

compared to the 2022-2023 FAST assessment. According to 2023-2024 performance by ethnicity, data indicates our ELL students performed below 41% in the area of ELA. Data also indicates 22% of the ELL students were proficient in 3rd grade ELA. Additionally, STAR data indicated that several students entered 3rd grade with a significant deficiency in phonics and early literacy skills.

### **Greatest Gap**

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 point that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is 3rd grade ELA. In comparison to the state average there is a 20% difference, on PM3 the state average was 55% proficient and Arcola's was 35%. Factors that contributed to the GAPs were a great amount of students entered grade 3 below grade level as a result of the 2023 STAR Reading PM3 data. There was also many students waiting to be staff/ IEP and high ESOL 1 population. In addition, data indicates students were deficient in the areas of vocabulary and reading comprehension.

### **EWS Areas of Concern**

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

---

An area of concern for our school are the number of retained 3rd grade students (24). Additionally, the increase of 62 students in 3rd grade with a substantial reading deficiency as compared to last year 56 students, which is a an increase of 6 students.

### **Highest Priorities**

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

---

The top priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year is student attendance, consistent implementation of reading intervention, consistently utilizing district aligned resources and monitoring from School Leadership Team.



## B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

### Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

### Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA required by RAISE (specific questions)

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

---

According to the 2024 FAST PM3 data, 35% of our 3rd grade students were proficient in ELA as compared to 49% in 2022-2023. Due to the decline in ELA proficiency incoming 4th grade students will be targeted. Based on this data and the identified contributing factor of a high number of level 1 and level 2 ELL students, incoming 4th graders are well below grade level and a high level of 3rd grade students being retained (24). The gradual release model will be used to ensure explicit instruction is provided during the ELA block.

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

---

According to the 2023-2024 Star PM3 assessment data, our primary students (K-2) 40 % were proficient in ELA as compared to 45% in the district. As a result, we will implement the evidence based strategy of utilizing the strategy of Gradual Release of Responsibility Model. The Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model (GRRM) is a particular style of teaching which is a structured method of pedagogy framed around a process beginning with explicit instruction. Students are guided through the learning process with clear statements about the purpose and rationale for learning the new skill. The GRRM is distinguished by four phases: (I do) clear explanations and demonstrations of the instructional target, (We do) providing strategic guided practice and feedback, (They do) gradually releasing students to practice the new skill collaboratively, and (You do) eventually requiring students to demonstrate mastery of the learning target independently.

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

---

According to the 2023-2024 FAST PM3 assessment data, 47 percent of our intermediate students (3-5) were proficient in ELA, which was 3 percentage points below our goal of 50 percent. As a result, we will implement the evidence based strategy of The gradual Release Model of Responsibility. The Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model (GRRM) is a particular style of teaching which is a structured method of pedagogy framed around a process beginning with explicit

instruction. Students are guided through the learning process with clear statements about the purpose and rationale for learning the new skill. The GRRM is distinguished by four phases: (I do) clear explanations and demonstrations of the instructional target, (We do) providing strategic guided practice and feedback, (They do) gradually releasing students to practice the new skill collaboratively, and (You do) eventually requiring students to demonstrate mastery of the learning target independently.

---

**Grades K-2: Measurable Outcome(s)**

---

With the implementation of the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model with the focus on setting high expectations and instructional delivery an additional 5% (for a total of 45%) of the K-2 grade students will score at grade level or above in area of ELA on FAST PM3.

---

**Grades 3-5: Measurable Outcome(s)**

---

With the implementation of the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model with the focus on setting high expectations and instructional delivery an additional an additional 8% (for a total of 45%) of the third grade students will score at grade level or above in area of ELA on FAST PM3.

**Monitoring**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

---

The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to ensure the implementation of the Gradual Release Model of Responsibility are being implemented with fidelity. In addition, the Reading Coach will ensure the GRRM is being utilized during collaborative planning and being utilized during the reading block.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Ms. Kennise Hill (Reading Coach), Ms. Leasha Hill (AP), Ms. Yolanda Ellis (AP)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

**Description of Intervention #1:**

The Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model (GRRM) is a particular style of teaching which is a structured method of pedagogy framed around a process beginning with explicit instruction. Students are guided through the learning process with clear statements about the purpose and rationale for learning the new skill. The GRRM is distinguished by four phases: (I do) clear explanations and demonstrations of the instructional target, (We do) providing strategic guided practice and feedback, (They do) gradually releasing students to practice the new skill collaboratively, and (You do) eventually requiring students to demonstrate mastery of the learning target independently.

**Rationale:**

The evidenced-based strategy of the gradual release model was chosen as it addresses an explicit instructional framework and at the same time holds the teacher accountable for maintaining high expectations for all students.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**

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 to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention.

Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

**Action Step #1**

Data Review

**Person Monitoring:**

Kennise Hill

**By When/Frequency:**

8/12-9/27

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Teachers will review student FAST data from the 2023-2024 School Year during the 1st Collaborative Planning session of the 2024-2025 School Year. During collaborative planning the coach will ensure teachers are planning for each component of the gradual release model for each lesson on a weekly basis. The purpose of this action step is to develop teachers' knowledge of learners through analyzing previous data and be able to provide instruction based on students' learning needs. This will be monitored by administration participating in collaborative planning as well as intentional walk-throughs with a focus on GRRM.

**Action Step #2**

Extended Learning Opportunities

**Person Monitoring:**

Kennise Hill

**By When/Frequency:**

8/12-9/27

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Teachers will provide weekly opportunities for additional explicit reading instruction utilizing the gradual release model throughout the school day. The purpose of this action step is to maximize learning opportunities for students within a smaller group setting outside of the instructional block for students that were unable to grasp the concept being taught upon first exposure. This action step will be monitored by administration on a weekly basis.

**Action Step #3**

Targeted Tutoring

**Person Monitoring:**

Kennise Hill

**By When/Frequency:**

8/12-9/27

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Teachers will provide afterschool tutoring for targeted 3rd grade students utilizing the gradual release model, that are working below grade-level in the area of ELA. The purpose of this action step is to

provide 3rd grade students with additional extended learning opportunities based on the FAST Reading PM1 results. This action step will be monitored by administration on a weekly basis.

## **Area of Focus #2**

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

### **Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**

#### **Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

According to the 2024-2025 EWI Dashboard on PowerBI, a total of 168 students within grades 1-5 have a substantial Reading deficiency as compared to the 2023-2024 EWI Dashboard on PowerBI where only 182 K-5 students had a substantial reading deficiency. Based on the data the identified contributing factor was the inconsistency of daily scheduled additional reading support not being utilized with fidelity. We will implement the Targeted Element of Reading Intervention.

#### **Measurable Outcome**

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

With the implementation of targeted Reading Intervention with a focus on collaborative data chats, instructors will analyze intervention data to determine the effectiveness of intervention instruction and regroup students so that we can meet their individual needs. Teachers will be able to effectively deliver Tiered Intervention Instruction in grades K-5, which will increase student reading proficiency 47% to 52% on the 2024-2025 FAST PM3 state assessment, as evidence through students' skill checks and chapter assessments.

#### **Monitoring**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

On a weekly basis the leadership team will conduct walk throughs to ensure that Reading Intervention is being implemented with fidelity. Teachers and Students will maintain a Reading Intervention Log/ Journal with evidence of activities by standards which will enhance students' identified areas of weakness.

#### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Leasha Hill

#### **Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the

measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

**Description of Intervention #1:**

During Collaborative Data Chats, teachers, support staff, and administration analyze student performance data and determine how that information will be used to drive future instruction (incorporation of virtual platforms can be utilized to encourage collaborative data chats). Time is also allotted to discuss activities and strategies teachers have used to remediate and/or enrich students on the assessed standards. Students who are in Rtl or who are identified as fragile are also discussed. This ensures they are receiving the proper support. Data chats are also a time to discuss teacher needs as it relates to additional assistance needed in the classroom, and in what ways both administration and support staff can assist teachers with those needs.

**Rationale:**

The evidence based strategy of Collaborative Data Chats was selected as it addresses analyzing students' performance data to help drive future instruction. Many of our students are working below grade-level and the Collaborative Data Chats will allow teachers and the coach to frequently review data and make informed decisions regarding students' grouping and appropriate resources that will result in students making progress.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**

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 to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

**Action Step #1**

Data Review

**Person Monitoring:**

Kennise Hill

**By When/Frequency:**

8/12-9/27

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Instructional Coach and Teachers will participate in a collaborative data chat to review 2023-2024 FAST/ STAR PM3 data to group students appropriately as Tier 2 and Tier 3 during collaborative planning. Reviewing students data will allow teachers to become knowledgeable of the students inside their classroom as well as the level of support that will be needed to provided support to all Tier 2 and Tier 3 students appropriately. This will be monitored by administration on a weekly basis.

**Action Step #2**

Teacher/Student Collaborative Data Chat

**Person Monitoring:**

Leasha Hill

**By When/Frequency:**

8/12-9/27

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Bi-Weekly teachers will conduct collaborative data chats with students regarding their intervention

data/progress and set goals for achieving mastery. The school Leadership Team will monitor the impact of this action step during weekly walkthrough.

**Action Step #3**

Student Work Products

**Person Monitoring:**

Leasha Hill

**By When/Frequency:**

8/12-9/27

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Teachers will be asked to bring student work products of randomly selected students to collaborative data chats to thoroughly review feedback and reteach opportunities. The School Leadership Team will implement weekly walkthroughs with a focus on student intervention work products and progress.

**Area of Focus #3**

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

**Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation****Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

---

According to the 2023- 2024 FAST PM3 data, 39% of ELL students were proficient in the area of ELA as compared to 2022-2023 FAST PM3 data, where only 27% of our ELLs were proficient. Based on data and identified contributing factors of: high number of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students, student readiness level limit abilities to master grade level tasks. Therefore, we selected the overarching area of Differentiated Instruction to provide our ELL students with an increased opportunity to enhance the English Acquisition Skills.

**Measurable Outcome**

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

---

With the evidence based strategy of Differentiated Instruction, 44% of ELL students in grades 3-5 will be proficient on the 2024-2025 FAST PM3 reading state assessment.

**Monitoring**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

---

On a weekly basis the leadership team will conduct walk throughs to ensure that DI is being implemented with fidelity. Students will maintain a DI Folder/Journal with evidence of differentiated activities by standards which will enhance their identified areas of weakness. Students that are not progressing on the OPM's will be targeted through Extended Learning Opportunities.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Leasha Hill

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

**Description of Intervention #1:**

The evidence based strategy of Differentiated Instruction is a framework for effective teaching that involves providing students with innovative educational opportunities for acceleration based on their identified area of weakness. Through this process high expectations can be maintained for all students.

**Rationale:**

The evidence based strategy of Differentiated Instruction will be utilized to mitigate learning loss and meet students' individual needs through small group instruction. This strategy will focus on the students' areas of weakness that were evident during the 2023-2024 school year and based on the increasing amount of level 1 students on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**

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 to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

**Action Step #1**

Data Review

**Person Monitoring:**

Kennise Hill

**By When/Frequency:**

8/12-9/27

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Teachers will review students current FAST PM1 data from the 2024-2025 School Year during Collaborative Planning. The purpose of this action step is to develop teachers knowledge of learners through analyzing students most recent data to provide instruction based on students' learning needs. This will be monitored by administration participating in collaborative planning on a weekly basis.

**Action Step #2**

Differentiated Resources

**Person Monitoring:**

Kennise Hill

**By When/Frequency:**

8/12-9/27

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Teachers will be provided with DI folders, student trackers, and District-aligned resources to



effectively implement differentiated instruction. This action step will be monitored by administration on a weekly basis.

### **Action Step #3**

Job-Embedded Professional Development

**Person Monitoring:**

Kennise Hill

**By When/Frequency:**

8/12-9/27

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Teachers will participate in a Job-Embedded professional development with a focus on implementing effective Differentiated Instruction (DI) and resource selection in Math and English Language Arts (ELA). This action step is an effective way to enhance teaching practices and improve student outcomes.

## **IV. Positive Culture and Environment**

### **Area of Focus #1**

Student Attendance

#### **Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

---

The EWI data indicates an increase in the percentage of students with more than 11 absences when comparing 2023-2024 to 2022-2023, student attendance is still an area of concern. In the 2023-2024 school year 59 percent of students were absent 11 or more days, which is a 3 percent increase from the 2022-2023 school year. Historically students that are habitually absent from school do not perform as well as those who are regularly in attendance.

#### **Measurable Outcome**

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

---

If we successfully implement the evidence-based strategy of school-wide attendance initiatives the percentage points of students who are absent more than 11 or more days will decrease by 5% by the end of the 2024-2025 school year.

#### **Monitoring**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

---

With the evidence based strategy of Attendance Initiatives teachers will identify students with 5 or more absence and refer to the Attendance Review Committee. Daily calls will be made to parents



after each absence. Home visits and referrals to outside agencies will also be conducted for students with excessive absences. In addition quarterly, incentives for students with perfect attendance will be provided.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Ginger Clarke

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

**Description of Intervention #1:**

The leadership team will utilize the evidence based strategy of Attendance Initiatives. Strategic Attendance Initiatives involve close monitoring and reporting of student absences, calls to parents, and more direct measures including home visits, counseling and referrals to outside agencies as well as incentives for students with perfect attendance.

**Rationale:**

The 2024 - 2025 SIP data indicates that there is a critical need to improve student attendance. Consistently acknowledging and celebrating student attendance will promote a positive school culture and increase student morale. By implementing attendance initiatives students will feel empowered and improve academically.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

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

No

**Action Steps to Implement:****Action Step #1**

Attendance Review Committee

**Person Monitoring:**

Ginger Clarke

**By When/Frequency:**

8/12-9/27

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Attendance Review Committee will contact parents of students tardy or absent 5 or more days to explain MDCPS Attendance Policies, the importance of students attending school daily, and how it contributes to learning loss.

**Action Step #2**

100 day Attendance Incentive

**Person Monitoring:**

Ginger Clarke

**By When/Frequency:**

8/12-9/27

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Students that attended the first 100 days of school without absences or being tardy will be

acknowledge and celebrated.

**Action Step #3**

Principal Attendance Incentive

**Person Monitoring:**

Yolanda Ellis

**By When/Frequency:**

8/12-9/27

**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

The class with 100% attendance will receive a class incentive as identified in the Principals 100% attendance 10-Day Challenge.

## V. Title I Requirements (optional)

### A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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 ESEA Section 1114(b). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

#### Dissemination Methods

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(4))

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

---

Arcola Lake Elementary School will disseminate School Improvement Plan to stakeholders through various channels such as school websites, emails, parent-teacher meetings, and physical copies sent home with students. The plan's objectives, strategies, and progress updates are communicated to parents, teachers, students, and the community to ensure transparency and collaboration in the school's improvement efforts.

#### Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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 Parental and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available. (ESEA 1116(b-g))

---

Arcola Lake Elementary School will build positive relationships with all stakeholders by implementing strategies such as open communication, regular updates, involving all stakeholders in decision-making processes, addressing concerns promptly, and organizing collaborative events. These efforts will foster a sense of community and mutual trust.

arcolalake.dadeschools.net (Parent Resources)

#### Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

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. (ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)ii))

---

Arcola Lake Elementary School will strengthen academic programs through various strategies, including curriculum enhancements, teacher training, incorporating new technologies, and collaborating with ETO and after school programs. These efforts aim to improve the quality of education, offer more diverse learning opportunities, and keep up with evolving educational trends.

**How Plan is Developed**

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). (ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4))

---

The development of a school improvement plan in coordination with other federal programs involves several steps. First, educators and administrators analyze data to identify areas needing improvement. Then, align the plan with federal program requirements and goals, ensuring integration. Collaboration between program coordinators, teachers, and stakeholders is essential to create a comprehensive and unified strategy. Regular communication and assessment help maintain coordination and alignment between the school improvement plan and federal initiatives.

## **B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan**

### **Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable**

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

#### **Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas**

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

---

Arcola Lake Elementary takes a comprehensive approach to supporting students' development beyond academic subjects by offering a range of services and programs. These programs includes Individual Counseling , Group Counseling, Crisis Counseling, School-Based Mental Health Services, Specialized Support Services, Parental and Community Involvement. By integrating these services and strategies, ALE aims to address the holistic needs of students and support their growth in areas beyond academics.

#### **Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce**

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

---

MDCPS aim to equip students with the knowledge, skills, and experiences necessary to make informed decisions about their futures and to successfully transition to postsecondary education or the workforce.

#### **Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services**

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 ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III)).

---

Arcola Lake Elementary is implementing a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, often referred to as a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) or Positive Behavioral Interventions. PBI involves a structured approach to promoting positive behavior and intervening early when issues arise. This model is designed to support all students, with varying levels of need, through a tiered system of interventions. Implementing this structured, tiered approach and coordinating with IDEA-related services, ALE has created a supportive environment that addresses a wide range of behavioral needs and supports student success both academically and behaviorally.

#### **Professional Learning and Other Activities**

---

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. (ESEA section 11149b)(7)(iii(V)).

---

Arcola Lake Elementary provides regularly scheduled workshops focus on best practices for instruction, differentiation, and integrating technology. Teachers are trained in how to analyze and interpret academic assessment data to inform instruction. This includes understanding assessment results, identifying student needs, and making data-driven instructional decisions. ELA Instructional Coach work with teachers one-on-one or in small groups to provide personalized support on instructional practices, classroom management, and using assessment data effectively. ALE experienced teachers mentor newer or less experienced teachers, offering guidance on best practices, classroom strategies, and professional growth. ALE continuously provides ongoing professional development and career advancement opportunities helps retain effective teachers by supporting their professional growth and career progression. ALE continuously aims to improve instructional quality, effectively use data to drive student success, and recruit and retain skilled educators, particularly in high-need areas.

### **Strategies to Assist Preschool Children**

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

---

Arcola Lake Elementary implements several strategies to support transitioning preschool children to elementary. Regular communication between preschool staff and elementary school personnel ensures that information about each child's developmental progress, needs, and strengths is shared. Aligning curricula and instructional practices between preschool and elementary programs helps ease the transition. ALE provides orientation sessions for parents to familiarize them with the elementary school environment, expectations, and available resources. Training for preschool and elementary teachers focuses on understanding child development, effective transition strategies, and ways to support children's emotional and social adjustment. ALE aims to create a supportive and seamless transition for preschool children, ensuring that they are well-prepared and excited to begin their elementary school journey.

**VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review**

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

**Process to Review the Use of Resources**

Describe the process to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

No Answer Entered

**Specifics to Address the Need**

Identify the specific resource(s), rationale (i.e., data) and plan to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

No Answer Entered

**VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus**

Check if this school is eligible for 2024-25 UniSIG funds but has chosen not to apply.

**No**



| BUDGET            | ACTIVITY | FUNCTION/<br>OBJECT | FUNDING<br>SOURCE | FTE | AMOUNT |
|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|-----|--------|
| Plan Budget Total |          |                     |                   |     | 0.00   |