Norland Middle School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Norland Middle School

1235 NW 192ND TER, Miami, FL 33169

http://wwwnms.dade.k12.fl.us/

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.

Norland Middle School seeks to equip students academically, socially, and emotionally through increased exposure to diversity utilizing technology and real-world experiences. Our goal is to develop ethical, independent, thinkers and scholars who accept their responsibilities as local, national, and global citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Norland Middle School enriches the neighboring community through the conveyance of the cultural heritage of the nation; the provision of the best possible educational experiences to our students and the surrounding community; the extension of the services of the school to encompass the needs of the whole individual; and the provision of a center for community services.

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
Challenger, Sacha	Principal	As the principal, Dr. Challenger ensures that all academic polices and curricula are followed. She oversees daily operations and creates a system to monitor and track measures of academic success. Her mission is to help maximize teaching potential by establishing an open-door policy for all stakeholders to share, express, and develop solutions for their concerns. Dr. Challenger ensures that Norland Middle is a safe, welcoming atmosphere free of bias in which students can achieve their maximum potential by developing a culture of shared leadership, building capacity of teachers and developing student leaders.
Douglas , Dannitra	Assistant Principal	As an Assistant Principal, Mrs. Douglas assists in all academic policies and curriculum. She develops systems to track standards and measure the success of Reading, Language Arts and Social Science departments. Mrs. Douglas' mission is to help maximize educators' potential by building their capacity through meaningful professional development. Her goal is to create an atmosphere that is free of bias and is student centered. Mrs. Douglas' goal is to increase student potential by encouraging them to become leaders both in school and in their communities. Mrs. Douglas provides the vision and leadership to develop, administer and monitor English Language Arts, Reading and Social Sciences. She is skilled in optimizing the resources in those programs and to develop safe programs for all stakeholders.
Hayes, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	As an Assistant Principal, Mrs. Hayes assists in all academic policies and curriculum. She develops systems to track standards and measures the success of her departments. Her mission is to help grow our Visual and Preforming Arts Magnet program while developing relationships with feeder-pattern elementary schools. Her goal is to create an atmosphere that is free of bias and is student centered. Her goals is to increase student potential by encouraging them to become leaders both in school and their communities. Mrs. Hayes provides the vision and leadership to develop, administer, and monitor Math and Science. She is skilled in optimizing the resources in those programs and to develop safe programs for all stakeholders.
Delancy, Nicole	Math Coach	As an Instructional Coach, Mrs. Delancy-Charles assists in all academic polices related to the Math curriculum. She is skilled at developing systems that help teachers and administrators track benchmarks that measure the success of the school. Her mission is to help maximize teacher and student potential by encouraging them to become leaders at Norland Middle School. Mrs. Delancy-Charles provides the vision and leadership to develop, administer, and monitor student achievement. She is skilled in optimizing the resources in those programs and to develop safe programs for all stakeholders.
Storr, Lavanya	Teacher, ESE	As an ESE teacher, Ms. Storr assists students with disabilities in their academics. Ms. Storr is the extra layer of support for our SWD students to assist in integrating the instructional strategies to support the needs of all learners and increase accommodations for our students with disabilities.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pacheco, Ennovy	Teacher, K-12	As a Reading teacher, Ms. Pacheco will implement the use the Read 180/ System 44 program to administer diagnostic tests, evaluate students' reading comprehension skills, and identify areas where students need additional support. Likewise, she will teach specific reading strategies, monitor students' progress and adjust her teaching approach as needed. This may involve providing additional support to struggling students, challenging advanced readers, and collaborating with other teachers and support staff to ensure that all students receive the support they need to succeed.
Moricette, Rodh	Teacher, K-12	As a science teacher, Ms. Moricette will assist with providing extended opportunities to students in order to assist with enrichment and remediation within the science curriculum.
Booker, Cynthia	SAC Member	Mrs. Booker is a member of our EESAC committee. She will assist and help monitor the practices and implementation of the SIP.

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.

Norland Middle School takes a proactive approach to involving stakeholders. The school boasts an active EESAC and PTSA where the SIP is on the meeting agenda regularly. The school has also established a curriculum leader group, the Husky Council, which meets twice a month. Leadership team meetings are held weekly. These groups act as a platform for sharing information and updates about the School Improvement Process as well as obtaining feedback on action steps which have been implemented.
In addition to the aforementioned teacher groups, the school also has a Student Government Association. SGA officers meet regularly with the administrative team to provide feedback from students obtained during SGA general body meetings.

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))

Norland Middle School will put the following systems of measurement in place as a way to monitor the implementation and impact of the SIP areas of focus:
1. Professional Development Wednesday post-session surveys
2. Monitoring of MyOn reports to ensure the platform is being used with fidelity and there is evidence of student growth
3. One of the look-fors during administrative walk-throughs will be evidence of implementation of English Language Learner strategies.
4. Students With Disabilities students will be grouped on iReady as an additional way to monitor student

progress

5. Monthly "Husky Pup" surveys will be used as a "temperature check" at the school to determine the success of 6th grade students' transition into middle school.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	100%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	TSI
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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	54	59	162
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	20	33	77
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	17	8	59
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	1	26	72
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	80	92	274
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	30	62	143
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	118	137	392
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	50	78	211

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	55	65	158
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	31	38	87
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	8	9	48
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	56	92	231
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	1	72	184
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	55	65	158
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	31	38	87
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	8	9	48
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	56	92	231
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	1	72	184
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	36			28			34		
ELA Learning Gains	46			32			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34			25			36		
Math Achievement*	38			19			34		
Math Learning Gains	63			18			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64			22			41		

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	37			33			44		
Social Studies Achievement*	62			45			53		
Middle School Acceleration	83			57			88		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	80			42			70		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	27	Yes	3	3
ELL	47			
AMI				

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%
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP	45			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	54			

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	36	46	34	38	63	64	37	62	83			80
SWD	13	32	26	18	47	45	5	28				
ELL	22	39	38	33	63	68	35	41				80
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	46	35	37	63	63	36	62	82			77
HSP	42	48	10	50	64		50	50				
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	34	46	35	36	63	65	36	61	83			80

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	28	32	25	19	18	22	33	45	57			42
SWD	13	30	26	6	11	14	9	27				27

| **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
ELL	22	40	40	15	17	24	19	50				42
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	32	24	19	19	24	33	45	57			50
HSP	30	38	21	19	16	8						
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	26	31	25	19	18	23	32	43	55			43

| **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	34	43	36	34	43	41	44	53	88			70
SWD	6	29	27	5	24	27	0	18				
ELL	13	42	43	29	35	41	19	44				70
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	43	36	34	43	41	43	53	89			67
HSP	31	46	43	35	46		31	63				
MUL	46	64		50	45							
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	33	43	35	34	43	41	44	53	87			73

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.

Our team has determined that the FAST ELA Reading PM3 showed the lowest performance. According to available data, 34% of students were deemed proficient in Reading. This performance could be attributed to the following:
- Teacher absences largely contributed to the low performance of our students. There was a significant interruption of instruction due to teachers being out for multiple days, and in one case, an extended period.
- There was a lack of consistency across the department with respect to differentiated instruction. There were two major issues with DI this year: consistency and focus in the teacher-led center. DI did not occur regularly enough for it to be impactful. In some classrooms, too much time was spent in whole group lessons which caused teachers to lose valuable instructional time working with targeted students. In some instances, when teachers met with students in the teacher-led center, their work with targeted students was surface level. There were missed opportunities to dig deeper into the benchmark.
- Overall alignment between Language Arts and Reading was not there. The two subject areas were not operating in such a way that one was supporting the other.

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

According to available data, reading has shown the greatest decline from the previous year. There was a 2% decrease in Reading proficiency from 2022 to 2023. As previously stated, this decline may be attributed to teacher attendance and lack of consistency with differentiated instruction.

After looking closely at this year's Reading data, it was found that our 6th grade students had the lowest proficiency in Reading, just 29%. This shows that this performance correlates to the interruption of instruction due to 6th grade teacher attendance.

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.

Reading has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Specifically, 32% of our 6th grade students showed proficiency in reading compared to the state's 72%. As previously stated, this gap can be attributed to the interruption to learning due to teacher attendance. Also, differentiated instruction did not occur on a consistent basis.

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

FAST Mathematics data showed the most improvement with 49% (57% clean data including Algebra EOC percentage) of students achieving proficiency. According to the 2021-2022 math assessment from last school year, our math proficiency rate was 38%. The following steps were taken in order to attain this growth:

1. Utilized collaborative planning to develop lessons that aligned the foundations class instruction to core the class.
2. Implemented tiered differentiated instruction groups that utilized computer-based programs to provided targeted review lessons aligned to the B.E.S.T standards.
3. Provided students with manipulatives, such as calculators, to assist with the problem-solving process during whole group and independent practice.

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

Overall, 6th grade is our most concerning area. According to the Early Warning Systems data, 129 sixth graders had two or more indicators, which included 99 with substantial reading deficiencies. Additionally, there were 100 level 1 students in ELA FAST PM3, and 51 level 1 FAST PM3/EOC level 1 students in math. There were a number of 6th grade students who were over age. Of those students, 71% are not proficient in ELA. Finally, students who are failing ELA and Math are of great concern.

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

1. 6th grade reading proficiency
2. Putting systems in place to aid 6th graders with transitioning into middle school
3. Student enrollment and retention
4. Teacher attendance

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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

According to FAST PM3 data, 34% of students were proficient in reading compared to 61% of students in the district. The team identified the following contributing factors: students' weak foundational skills and inconsistent remediation of the benchmarks. When looking more closely at the PM3 data, students were found to have struggled the most in the area of "Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary". Students were shown to be below proficiency in areas such as Morphology, Connotation, and Interpretation of Figurative Language. These are foundational skills which are necessary for comprehension.

Additionally, the remediation of benchmarks was not done on a consistent basis. Differentiated Instruction was not always done with fidelity. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors, we will implement targeted element of Student Engagement.

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

With the implementation of Student Engagement, student proficiency will increase by 5% by June 2024

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

The administrative team will conduct weekly walk-throughs to ensure the implementation of student engagement strategies. Likewise, teachers will incorporate the use of anchor charts to assist students in understanding concepts, and emojis as a method of Checking for Understanding

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dannitra Douglas (ddouglas@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.)

With the targeted element of Student Engagement, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy: Interactive Learning Environment. Reading and ELA teachers will develop and execute lessons which allow opportunities for student collaboration and remediation of weaker skills. During PD Wednesday sessions, teachers will receive training on technology and strategies they can incorporate to support reading proficiency. The leadership team will plan quarterly "Parent Pit Stops" where parents will be invited to visit the campus to review student academic process.

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

An Interactive Learning Environment fosters an environment where students take ownership of their learning. Additionally, creating opportunities for parents to visit the school and take a more proactive role in the educational process.

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.

Implement foundational content bell ringer activities in ELA classrooms. Incorporating the used of bell ringers which focus on foundational skills, provide teachers will an additional opportunity to remediate areas where students have shown deficiencies.

Person Responsible: Dannitra Douglas (ddouglas@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/28/23

Introduce mini anchor chart resources to Reading and Language Arts teachers. Presenting this idea to the department and inviting teachers decide what the charts will focus on will encourage teachers to take ownership of the idea.

Person Responsible: Lavanya Storr (lstorr22@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/18/23

Develop first set of mini anchor charts to be used for writing in Reading and Language Arts. The use of the mini-anchor charts will provide students with an additional reference point while learning a concept or benchmark.

Person Responsible: Lavanya Storr (lstorr22@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/18/23

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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

According to the 2023-2024 Early Warning Systems data, 129 sixth graders had two or more indicators, which included 99 with substantial reading deficiencies, 100 level 1 on 2023 ELA FAST PM3, and 51 level 1 on 2023 Math FAST PM3/EOC. The 2022-2023 data shows that there were only 83 students with two or more indicators.

A students' 6th grade year, the first year in middle school, may be viewed as a transitional period. The student has left the elementary school setting, and entering middle school where they have more responsibilities, and the expectation of self-sufficiency is greater.

Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of difficult Elementary to Middle School transition, we will implement the target element of Early Warning Systems.

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

With the implementation of Early Warning Systems, the number of 6th grade students having two or more EWS indicators will decrease by 5% by June 2024.

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

The administrative team will meet with the counselors weekly to ensure visits to 6th grade classrooms are occurring. Additionally, every month, 6th graders will complete short surveys designed to follow-up on how they are assimilating into the school culture.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffany Hayes (tlhayes@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 Early Warning Systems, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy: Student-Staff Connections. 6th grade team members will be assigned a cohort of 6th grade students that they will mentor. Additionally, the staff will receive professional development on student mental health and socio-emotional strategies.

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

Improving student-staff connections fosters a school culture where students feel seen and accepted. These connections assist students and their families with the transition into middle school by creating an avenue for students to learn valuable skills needed to be successful as they matriculate through middle school.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The 6th grade team leader will introduce "Husky Pup Success in Sixth Program" during grade level team meeting. At this time, Early Warning Systems data will be shared with the teachers in as a way of getting them to buy in to the program.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Hayes (tlhayes@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/19/23

Grade level team leader will assign 6th grades students to their respective grade level Pack Leader. Making teachers responsible for a specific group of students will help students to be seen and encourage the community-building.

Person Responsible: Ennovy Pacheco (epacheco@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/28/23

Student Services will facilitate a Professional Development Wednesday session focusing student mental health and building relationships. Providing teachers with resources and teaching them best practices they can implement may encourage them to buy-in to the process.

Person Responsible: Dannitra Douglas (ddouglas@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/20/23

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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 our 2022-2023 subgroup data, only 19% of English Language Learners were proficient in reading. The district percentage for this subgroup is 43%. Based on the data and the contributing factors of deficits in oral language proficiency, we will implement the targeted element of Intervention.

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

With the implementation of Interventions, the proficiency of our English Language Learners will increase by 5% by June 2024.

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

The administrative team will conduct weekly walk-throughs to ensure the implementation of ELL instructional tools and Intervention strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dannitra Douglas (ddouglas@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.)

With the targeted element of Interventions, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy: English Language Learner strategies. Language Arts through ESOL, Social Science, and Science teachers will implement the use of MyOn as a supplemental tool for students.

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

English Language Learner strategies supports academic and oral language proficiency which in turn, improves students' reading comprehension skills. Additionally, during the last quarter of the 22-23 school year, our ELL population grew significantly. With this in mind, it would behoove us to put systems in place that would assist students acquiring the language.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Conduct 1st PD Wednesday session centered on ELL instructional strategies. As a result of this PD, teachers will be able to implement classroom best practices which support English Language Learners.

Person Responsible: Dannitra Douglas (ddouglas@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/6/23

Train teachers on the MyOn platform. By introducing teachers to the MyOn platform, we hope to provide them with an additional resource which can be used to support the English Language Learners in their classes.

Person Responsible: Rodh Moricette (333705@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/12/23

Cross Curricular usage of MyOn platform is implemented. The use of the MyOn platform in non-ELA content areas will provide English Language Learners with additional tools for understanding concepts and acquiring academic language.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Hayes (tlhayes@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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 Assessment, proficiency data, 13 percent of the Students with Disabilities (SWD) are proficient in ELA compared to Math where 28% of students are proficient. Differentiated Instruction was inconsistent last school year. Teacher-led small groups are the optimal time to work closely with students with disabilities. Based on the data, our targeted area of focus as indicated is student intervention and flexible/strategic grouping.

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

With the implementation of student interventions, SWD students in ELA, grades 6-8, will increase by 3 percentage points on the 2024 FAST Assessment.

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

The Leadership team will conduct walkthroughs with look-fors for evidence of flexible grouping. The leadership team should see evidence of student groups. Quarterly conferences will primarily focus on student interventions with the Students with Disabilities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dannitra Douglas (ddouglas@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.)

For this Area of Focus the Evidence-based Intervention is Flexible/Strategic Grouping. Student groupings should vary based on the needs of the students within the groups. The groupings should be fluid and change based on student progress.

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

By implementing the Evidence-based Intervention of Flexible/Strategic Grouping, student engagement will increase.
Teachers will use a variety of randomized grouping, FAST/i-Ready data, and student-led grouping, to engage the students. These engagements will provide opportunities for developing students to take an active leading role through student-led projects and increased proficiency by being heterogeneously grouped.

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.

Teachers will learn tools for randomize student grouping for whole group activities. If we support teachers by providing them with the proper tools, it is likely that they will buy-in.

Person Responsible: Rodh Moricette (333705@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/11/23

Data from i-Ready will be shared with other subjects and teachers will utilize the data to monitor and facilitate student progress within their subject interventions and groupings.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Hayes (tlhayes@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/31/23

Through PD Wednesday sessions, teachers will learn engagement strategies to aid students in becoming active learners through student led activities.

Person Responsible: Lavanya Storr (lstorr22@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23- Ongoing

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The school leadership team reviews the available resources and allocates them based on the greatest area of need. Title 1 funds will be used to hire interventionist support. Teachers will also be hired on an hourly basis to provide early-bird and after-school tutoring services. If available, funds from Title III will be used to provide tutoring support to our English Language Learners.

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

n/a

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

n/a

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.

The School Improvement Plan will be presented and disseminated at the annual Title One meeting to students, parents and all stakeholders. Additionally, the plan will be disseminated and reviewed at the first EESAC meeting. The SIP progress will be communicated during the monthly PTSA meetings and during the quarterly Parent Nights to all stake holders. The plan will be made available on the school website https://norlandmiddleschool.net/ under the parent tab.

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))

Norland Middle School will utilize the Community Involvement Specialist (CIS) and Trust Counselor to host parent workshops, disseminate resources, and collaborate with community partners to support the

needs of students. The school will utilize the Parent Resource Center to conduct parent meetings to inform parents of the various academic resources and tools available to assist their child. Moreover, Team Leaders will facilitate weekly meetings with parents to discuss and review their child's academic progress and interventions needed to ensure academic success.

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))

Norland Middle School will utilize their bi-weekly PD Wednesday sessions to help teachers build their capacity in various areas, including but not limited to flexible/strategic grouping, checks for understanding, and engagement strategies.

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: Student Engagement	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No