John F. Kennedy Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

John F. Kennedy Middle School

1075 NE 167TH ST, North Miami Beach, FL 33162

http://jfk.dadeschools.net

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

It is the mission of John F. Kennedy Middle School staff, students, parents and community to create an instructional environment which enhances individual achievement while promoting the development of responsible citizens who can efficiently access knowledge, critically assess problems and creatively seek solutions.

Provide the school's vision statement.

With new purpose and direction, we embark on an educational journey that focuses on increasing student achievement via implementation of curricular innovation while providing educational excellence for all.

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
Costa DeVito, Alicia	Principal	The principal conducts data chats with the faculty and reviews, discusses, and disseminates data to the faculty and stakeholders. The principal oversees all personnel at the school site and works collaboratively with the community and all stakeholders. She oversees the writing and implementation of the SIP.
	Assistant Principal	Oversee daily activities and operations, coordinate school support operations, utilizing knowledge of curriculum and instruction to improve student achievement, evaluate instructional programs and personnel, coordinate campus functions and activities, implement policies and procedures, and analyze and interpret date to improve school effectiveness.
Ledgister-Joseph, Shawana	Assistant Principal	Oversee daily activities and operations, coordinate school support operations, utilize knowledge of curriculum and instruction to improve student achievement, evaluate instructional programs and personnel, coordinate campus functions and activities, implement policies and procedures, and analyze and interpret date to improve school effectiveness.
Argarate, Erynn	Other	Assisting in guiding planning and the development of instructional focus within the ESE department. monitors the utilization of all district and region resources for instruction, plans and delivers lessons, administers assessments, uses data to provide differentiated instruction, and participates in the planning and delivery of professional development for staff.
Rignack, Jennifer	Other	Support teachers in the integration of blended learning through modeling, co-teaching, and coaching sessions. The Coach will build teacher capacity through professional development and shared training experiences.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

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

The leadership team will participate in SIP development through curriculum council meetings, teachers and school staff will participate through department meetings and the completion of monthly surveys, and families and communities will participate through their role in EESAC.

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))

School leadership team members will monitor SIP implementation through curriculum council meetings, classroom walkthroughs, student progress monitoring, monthly staff surveys, parental and community input, and attendance logs from parent and community meetings through Title 1 and the University of Miami JT McDonald Health Connect Initiative. This data will be shared quarterly with the stakeholders. The leadership team will determine if adjustments are needed by effectively processing the reasons for shortcomings and as a team develop strategies to combat challenges to the successful implementation of the SIP.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	97%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	31	35	45	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	34	23	97
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5	10	35
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	91	107	338
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	81	65	244
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	214	169	174	557

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	109	88	76	273

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	1	1	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	10

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	29	53	49	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	44	74	190
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	41	23	128
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	83	86	250
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	95	115	314
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	140	139	401

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	140	113	131	384

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	26	24	2	52
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	5	20

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	29	53	49	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	44	74	190
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	41	23	128
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	83	86	250
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	95	115	314
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	140	139	401

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	140	113	131	384

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	26	24	2	52
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	5	20

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	56	56	50	56	58	54
ELA Learning Gains	57	56	48	55	58	54
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42	48	38	43	52	47
Math Achievement*	51	55	54	51	58	58
Math Learning Gains	58	64	58	40	56	57
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48	63	55	34	54	51
Science Achievement*	66	51	49	59	52	51
Social Studies Achievement*	73	73	71	75	74	72
Middle School Acceleration	83			80		
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	36			61		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	570
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	45			
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	56			
HSP	59			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	57			

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	56	57	42	51	58	48	66	73	83			36
SWD	40	48	30	40	53	39	61	46				
ELL	35	45	33	29	44	37	34	57	60			36
AMI												
ASN	71	78		71	66		74		88			
BLK	54	55	40	48	56	48	65	74	82			39
HSP	62	62	40	57	64	48	69	64	92			32
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	55	59		50	47		75		58			
FRL	56	57	42	49	58	49	66	73	82			36

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	57	50	29	49	32	23	59	69	75			38
SWD	34	31	16	29	33	24	26	48				33
ELL	39	44	35	34	31	34	32	60	61			38
AMI												
ASN	71	62		76	47		73	75	87			
BLK	56	49	28	47	29	18	56	66	72			39
HSP	58	50	32	49	37	39	65	78	78			35
MUL	77	77		83	33							
PAC												
WHT	68	56		65	58							
FRL	55	48	28	48	31	23	57	70	74			39

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	56	55	43	51	40	34	59	75	80			61
SWD	26	39	25	31	35	31	28	45				
ELL	31	46	41	27	34	37	24	55	63			61
AMI												
ASN	77	66		83	52		75	92	92			
BLK	54	54	42	49	39	33	54	73	78			57
HSP	60	58	49	51	42	38	68	77	82			62
MUL	42	42		42	8							
PAC												
WHT	61	53		60	38		79		85			
FRL	55	55	43	49	39	34	56	74	78			64

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	51%	50%	1%	47%	4%
08	2023 - Spring	52%	51%	1%	47%	5%
06	2023 - Spring	46%	50%	-4%	47%	-1%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	49%	58%	-9%	54%	-5%
07	2023 - Spring	48%	48%	0%	48%	0%
08	2023 - Spring	60%	59%	1%	55%	5%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	40%	40%	0%	44%	-4%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	56%	37%	50%	43%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	52%	44%	48%	48%

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	65%	31%	63%	33%

CIVICS

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	68%	2%	66%	4%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

ELA remains an area that needs support. FAST results indicate that only 51% in grades 6-8 are proficient in ELA in comparison to the state average proficiency of 47%. Grades 6 through 8 resulted in a decrease of 6% points over last year and at 50% proficiency our students are even with the state and district average. ELA L25 is at 42% in grades 6th through 8th.

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

FAST results showed the greatest decline from the prior year in ELA. The introduction and implementation of new standards is the contributing factor to this decline. Additionally, the need to improve the academic vocabulary of our students is a key factor contributing to this decline. With the large number of ELL students at JFK Middle, it was determined that is imperative that we focus on comprehension of test items to support student performance.

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.

Mathematics had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Contributing factors include a lack of math fluency, new standards, and the increase of English Language Learners in our school population.

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

FAST results indicate the greatest improvement was in the area of mathematics scoring at 56% proficiency an increase of 14 percentage points from the previous years. We implemented after-school tutoring and Saturday tutoring, in addition to the activation of in-school interventionist sessions to increase math proficiency school-wide.

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

The greatest potential area of concern is the number of students failing one or two classes.

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

Increase academic proficiency, increase teacher morale, and responsible use of technology by students, remediate students in Levels 1 and 2, and increase the number of students who pass End of Course exams.

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 ELA

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

According to the 2022-2023 FAST PM3 data, 51% of 6-8 grade students were proficient in ELA compared to the state average of 47%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factor relating to knowledge of learners. The lack of knowledge of learners limits the ability of teachers to address the specific needs of individual students and provide meaningful instructional delivery. To positively impact student performance across all content areas, we will implement the Target Element of instructional delivery in ELA.

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-centered learning, an additional 5% for a total of 56% proficiency of the middle school population will score at grade level or above in the area of ELA.

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

The Administrative Team will conduct quarterly data chats and will follow up with regular walkthroughs to ensure quality instruction is occurring. The leadership team will conduct non-evaluative classroom visitations to ensure student-centered learning reflects the data. Effective teachers should adjust instruction based on performance data, as needed. Extended learning opportunities will be provided to those students who are not showing growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alicia Costa DeVito (adevito@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 ELA, our school will focus on the Evidenced-based Intervention of student-centered learning. Based on the framework of effective instruction, student-centered learning will facilitate instruction that is responsive student's current academic level. This allows teachers to develop lessons that are flexible and responsive, by either increasing rigor or scaffolding instruction.

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

Student-centered learning is a teaching method that allows teachers to tailor their instructional delivery to meet the specific needs of individual students. Our school demographic continues to evolve as the population in our neighborhood changes, and student-centered enables our teachers to address a variety of needs through the same lesson.

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.

August 14-September 29 - Through Professional Development and department meetings dig into effective practices for knowledge of learners and student-centered instruction through classroom interactions, classroom environment, and student engagement.

Person Responsible: Alicia Costa DeVito (adevito@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

August 14-September 29 - Increased support facilitation to provide targeted support to students.

Person Responsible: Erynn Argarate (erynna@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

During instructional walkthroughs, administrators will look for evidence and instructional delivery using a variety of student-centered strategies.

Person Responsible: Alicia Costa DeVito (adevito@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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

According to the 2022-2023 FAST PM3 data, 51% of 6-8 grade students were proficient in ELA compared to the state average of 47%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factor relating to knowledge of learners. The lack of knowledge of learners limits the ability of teachers to address the specific needs of individual students and provide meaningful instructional delivery. To positively impact student performance across all content areas, we will implement the Target Element of instructional practice in 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 digital innovation, providing targeted intervention through the facilitation of student-centered learning and using devices to ensure students are actively engaged in using technology as a tool rather than passively receiving information from technology. Using the Technology Integration Matrix, an additional 10% of the stakeholders will achieve adaptation level or above.

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

The VILS Coach will conduct quarterly non-evaluative walkthroughs to ensure quality instruction is occurring as students and teachers move through the Technology Integration Matrix (TIM) framework. The VILS Coach, as part of TIM, will meet with teachers regularly to ensure they are moving from teacher ownership to student ownership of technology as a learning tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Rignack (323894@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 Evidenced-based Intervention of digital innovation. Employing digital innovation will facilitate instruction that uses technology as a tool to close the digital divide by making technology tools available on a consistent basis, promoting student ownership, and positioning the teachers as a facilitator.

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

Digital innovation benefits students by creating active learning atmospheres, fostering creativity and innovation, and facilitating collaboration between students, teachers, and other key stakeholders regardless of distance or location. It breaks down barriers to education and personalizes learning for students, thus increasing student engagement and achievement.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

8/15 - Teachers will participate in a professional learning experience focusing on transformative technology through active and independent learning.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Rignack (323894@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 18, 2023

8/14-9/29 - VILS Coach will ensure students have consistent access to their devices for uninterrupted learning and can access their education through digital means.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Rignack (323894@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

8/14-9/29 - Teachers will implement professional learning from learning experience number one from the transformative technology training and develop action plans that prioritize student ownership and student engagement as part of the VILS program implementation.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Rignack (323894@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29

8/14-9/29 - The VILS coach will provide support and conduct classroom visits based on the action plans teachers developed as a component of the VILS program implementation.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Rignack (323894@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

According to the 2022-2023 School Climate Survey feedback from students, 28% of students Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed that they feel safe at their school, compared to 21% during 2021-2022 School Climate Survey feedback; this indicates an increase of 7 percentage points. This data indicates that there is a critical need to increase the perception of student safety. Students have identified that a considerable amount of negative student interaction results from inappropriate online behavior.

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

If we successfully implement programs to promote school safety, our student's perceptions of school safety will increase by 10 percentage points in the 2022-2023 Climate survey by June 2023.

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

Students will participate in a survey to determine how they use technology. Using these results, the leadership team and staff will develop lessons to better support safety and learning online. Quarterly, this survey will be re-administered to determine patterns and adjust digital citizenship lessons.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Rignack (323894@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 Area of Focus on Positive Culture and Environment, we will focus on Digital Citizenship to ensure students are proficient users of technology and know how to be safe online.

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

Focusing on digital citizenship will ensure the school is preserving the learning environment, reducing the ability of students to engage on social media and other non-academic platforms, including gaming, during class time. This will minimize the opportunity for students to use technology to make their peers feel uncomfortable, threatened, or unsafe in 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.

08/30-09/02 - Students will participate in Digital Citizenship survey to self-reflect on their use of technology and their role in the digital stratosphere.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Rignack (323894@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/26

8/14-9/26 - Schedule the first quarterly digital citizenship lesson to be implemented by social studies teachers.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Rignack (323894@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/26

8/14-9/26 - Develop a flyer for the JFK Schoology groups so parents can support the school with the digital citizenship initiative by sharing lessons and tips and trends with them on Digital Literacy.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Rignack (323894@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/26

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

According to the 2022-2023 School Climate Survey feedback from students, 36% of staff Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed that teacher morale is high at their school, compared to 75% during 2021-2022 School Climate Survey feedback; although this indicates an increase of 39 percentage points, there is still a serious need to increase this data point.

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

With the implementation of a celebrate success campaign to increase teacher morale, an additional 10% of the school staff will increase their perception of their happiness at the worksite as evidenced by results from the 2023-2024 School Climate survey by June 2023.

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

Teachers will participate in a survey to share ways they would like to be celebrated and recognized. Using these results, the leadership team will create opportunities and plan activities to celebrate success. Quarterly, this survey will be re-administered to monitor satisfaction and adjust accordingly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Within the Area of Focus of Positive Culture and Environment, we will focus on Celebrating Success to ensure staff morale is high.

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

Focusing on teacher morale and celebrating success will ensure staff and comfortable with their working conditions and enjoy their workplace. Staff members who are content in their work environment have fewer absences, therefore, positively impacting student achievement.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

8/14-9/29 - Teachers will complete a survey sharing ideas and strategies to increase teacher morale and how they would like to be recognized.

Person Responsible: Alicia Costa DeVito (adevito@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/26

8/14-9/29 - The administration will review the results and survey and create a monthly calendar of activities to celebrate success and recognize staff members.

Person Responsible: Alicia Costa DeVito (adevito@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/26

8/14-9/26 - The administration will implement the monthly recognition activity celebrating staff success.

Person Responsible: Alicia Costa DeVito (adevito@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/26

8/14-9/29 - The administration will review the results and survey and create a monthly calendar of activities to celebrate success and recognize staff members.

Person Responsible: Alicia Costa DeVito (adevito@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/26

8/14-9/26 - The administration will implement the monthly recognition activity celebrating staff success.

Person Responsible: Alicia Costa DeVito (adevito@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/26

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).

NA

Title I Requirements

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

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

The SIP will be disseminated to stakeholders during the Title 1 Annual parent meeting and during EESAC meetings.

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))

JFK Middle will build positive relationships with stakeholders by conducting monthly parent meetings based on the needs parents have expressed as areas of concern through parent needs surveys.

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 III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

JFK Middle will strengthen the academic program and increase the amount and quality of learning time by offering after-school tutoring programs and by purchasing extra resources to enrich the academic program.

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))

Our students benefit from the free/reduced lunch program and Project Upstart in coordination and integration with federal, state, and local services.

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: ELA	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes