Miami-Dade County Public Schools

SOUTH MIAMI K-8 CENTER

2026-27 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

SIP Authority 1

I. School Information 2

A. School Mission and Vision 2

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring 2

C. Demographic Data 5

D. Early Warning Systems 6

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 10

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 11

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 12

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 13

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup 14

E. Grade Level Data Review 17

III. Planning for Improvement 18

IV. Positive Learning Environment 24

V. Title I Requirements (optional) 30

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 33

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 34

School Board Approval

A "Record School Board Approval Date" tracking event has not been added this plan. Add this tracking event with the board approval date in the notes field to update this section.

SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), 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, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); 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, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., 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, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state’s graduation rate.

SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

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.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

South Miami K-8 Center enriches the community through the conveyance of the cultural heritage of the nation. The provision of the best possible educational experiences for our students will complement our mission to develop the whole child in an enriching academic environment and develop lifelong learners in pursuit of excellence, utilizing the visual, and expressive arts and technology.

Provide the school's vision statement

The staff, parents, and community of South Miami K-8 Center Expressive Arts Magnet believe that all students can learn, achieve, and develop to their fullest potential. In this joint venture, we accept the responsibility to foster the achievement of excellence in education, as it relates to citizenship, academics, and the integration of the expressive arts

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

1. School Leadership Membership

School Leadership Team

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

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Chris Penedo

Cpenedo@dadeschools.net

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The duties and responsibilities are to monitor and oversee all of the school's initiatives and respond to the concerns of stakeholders in a supportive manner.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name
Isha Brown

isbrown@dadeschools.net

Position Title
Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The duties and responsibilities are to monitor mentorship programs and oversee that all information is disseminated to the teachers in a timely manner.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name
Ilany De La Paz

idelapaz@dadeschools.net

Position Title
Teacher Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Teaches and leads the Cambridge department.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name
Marlissa Rodriguez

mrodriguez@dadeschools.net

Position Title
School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

School counselor supports students' academic, social-emotional, and personal development through guidance, intervention, and collaboration with teachers and families.

2. Stakeholder Involvement

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2).

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

Stakeholders such as school teachers, parents, administrators, educational support staff, students, and community members actively work together in the development of the School Improvement process. Input is taken during teacher meetings, from student surveys, academic data, and EESAC meetings to fine-tune the School Improvement plan.

3. SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the state academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

The SIP will be the guiding document used to drive instruction throughout the year. It will be used monthly during faculty meetings and EESAC committee meetings, and it will be referred back to during data chats that will happen periodically throughout the school year. The plan is an active document that will be revised through the year by stakeholders to ultimately achieve the school year's goals

C. Demographic Data

2026-27 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	**ACTIVE**
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	**COMBINATION** **PK-8**
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	**K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION**
2025-26 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	
2025-26 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	**72.6%**
CHARTER SCHOOL	**NO**
RAISE SCHOOL	**YES**
2025-26 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 07/09/2026	**ATSI**
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2025-26 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)** **BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK)*** **HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP)** **WHITE STUDENTS (WHT)** **ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)**
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY **2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.*	**2025-26: B** **2024-25: B** **2023-24: A** **2022-23: B** **2021-22: A**

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2026-27

Using 2025-26 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	
School Enrollment	35	30	31	51	75	82	45	50	54	453
Absent 10% or more school days	0	2	1	5	5	15	2	10	9	49
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	4
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		1	1	1				10		13
Course failure in Math		1		7		5	1			14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				8	12	13	7	3	12	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				6	13	11	7	5	4	46
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	2		3	13						18
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	1			5	3					9

Current Year 2026-27

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			2	11	14	19	8	11	15	80

Current Year 2026-27

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

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

Prior Year (2025-26) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
School Enrollment	36	32	50	76	75	85	62	62	32	510
Absent 10% or more school days		4		4	7	4	2	3	4	28
One or more suspensions					1			1		2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)			2	4	4	1	2	2	2	17
Course failure in Math		1		2	1	4	2		1	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				8	18	7	12	12	3	60
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				5	10	15	5	7	3	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)		1	2	11						14
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)		2		3	2					7

Prior Year (2025-26) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators		2	2	10	21	16	16	18	6	91

Prior Year (2025-26) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

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

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

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

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

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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

Data for 2025-26 had not been fully loaded to CIMS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2026			2025			2024		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	63	69	64	65	67	61	68	65	58
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	60	65	64	75	65	62	62	63	59
ELA Learning Gains	67	66	62	65	66	61	72	64	59
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59	58	55	57	58	55	60	58	54
Math Achievement*	64	71	64	64	69	62	66	68	59
Math Learning Gains	60	65	61	60	65	60	67	66	61
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46	57	52	51	59	53	65	63	56
Science Achievement	56	65	60	59	62	57	62	60	54
Social Studies Achievement*	67	84	77	68	82	74	84	79	72
Graduation Rate		79	77		81	72		78	71
Middle School Acceleration	83	82	79	70	79	75	74	77	71
College and Career Acceleration		79	61		75	56		76	54
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)					64	61		64	59

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

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

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

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

2025-26 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	63%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	625
Total Components for the FPPI	10
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2025-26	2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*
63%	64%	69%	62%	67%	49%	

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2025-26 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA SUBGROUP	FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX	SUBGROUP BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32%
Students With Disabilities	37%	Yes	1	
English Language Learners	59%	No		
Black/African American Students	38%	Yes	1	
Hispanic Students	66%	No		
White Students	71%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	55%	No		

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

2025-26 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2024-25	C&C ACCEL 2024-25	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	63%	60%	67%	59%	64%	60%	46%	56%	67%	83%			
Students With Disabilities	37%	45%	46%	46%	35%	38%	29%	23%	36%				
English Language Learners	57%	65%	68%	66%	58%	54%	48%	44%	53%	80%			
Black/African American Students	44%	23%	51%	35%	38%	43%	29%	39%					
Hispanic Students	64%	69%	68%	64%	68%	62%	54%	58%	65%	88%			
White Students	79%		71%		72%	71%		64%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	54%	52%	54%	45%	54%	55%	42%	43%	63%	85%			

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	65%	75%	65%	57%	64%	60%	51%	59%	68%	70%			65%
Students With Disabilities	44%	45%	65%	58%	41%	50%	48%	24%	64%				38%
English Language Learners	52%	76%	64%	49%	54%	58%	54%	44%	40%				65%
Black/African American Students	40%	50%	57%	67%	38%	33%	33%	31%					
Hispanic Students	68%	80%	66%	53%	67%	63%	57%	62%	69%	67%			67%
White Students	75%		64%		71%	59%							
Economically Disadvantaged Students	59%	71%	61%	53%	55%	50%	30%	51%	61%				59%

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	68%	62%	72%	60%	66%	67%	65%	62%	84%	74%			77%
Students With Disabilities	29%	20%	45%	50%	37%	59%	59%	17%					64%
English Language Learners	46%		59%	54%	58%	63%	60%	45%					77%
Black/African American Students	38%	31%	52%		38%	68%		27%					
Hispanic Students	70%	65%	73%	64%	68%	67%	63%	63%	86%	74%			78%
White Students	82%		77%		75%	68%		82%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	61%	46%	73%	63%	59%	66%	66%	60%	78%	68%			80%

E. Grade Level Data Review – State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

2025-26 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	3	59%	64%	-5%	60%	-1%
ELA	4	69%	64%	5%	60%	9%
ELA	5	62%	65%	-3%	61%	1%
ELA	6	60%	67%	-7%	62%	-2%
ELA	7	64%	67%	-3%	62%	2%
ELA	8	58%	65%	-7%	60%	-2%
Math	3	57%	72%	-15%	66%	-9%
Math	4	65%	71%	-6%	65%	0%
Math	5	63%	67%	-4%	62%	1%
Math	6	57%	67%	-10%	60%	-3%
Math	7	64%	58%	6%	53%	11%
Math	8	55%	65%	-10%	61%	-6%
Science	5	54%	59%	-5%	60%	-6%
Science	8	55%	49%	6%	52%	3%
Civics	7	67%	79%	-12%	77%	-10%
Algebra	8	85%	85%	0%	84%	1%
Geometry	8	** data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.*				

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Most Improvement

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

Fifth grade Science had the most improvement with 57% proficient increasing 5 percentage points from the 2025 PM3. The Interactive Science Journals were used along with the Edusmart Program. The evidence is measurable by a 5% increase.

Lowest Performance

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

Eighth grade Math had the lowest performance with a proficiency rate of 55% . Lack of data driven and small group instruction targeting lowest performance standards. Based on data between PM 1 and PM 3 the percentage of students moving from a level 2 to proficiency was only 5%.

Greatest Decline

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

The greatest decline was 8th grade Reading at 58% proficiency vs. 79% in 2025. This was a 21% decrease. A third of the 8th grade students were in intensive Reading. There was a lack of foundational skills and teacher turn over mid year.

Greatest Gap

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

The data with the largest gap compared to state average was 3rd grade Mathematics with a 9% gap. Students lack of foundational math skills and lack of data driven instruction focused on student math deficiencies.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

The high number of students scoring a Level 1 in ELA in grades 3-8th. Students lack of foundational skills and lack of data driven instruction focusing on student needs.

Highest Priorities

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

1. Reading proficiency specifically related to the lowest 25% in grade 3-8.
2. Math proficiency related to the lowest 25% in grades 3-8.
3. Kindergarten Reading proficiency.
4. Differentiated Instruction based on student data analysis Based on the data reviewed, the school's top priorities are improving reading proficiency for students in the lowest 25% of Grades 3–8, increasing mathematics proficiency for students in the lowest 25% of Grades 3–8, strengthening kindergarten reading proficiency, and enhancing differentiated instruction through ongoing student data analysis. These priorities are supported by assessment results showing achievement gaps among the lowest-performing students in reading and mathematics, early literacy data indicating the need for stronger foundational reading skills in kindergarten, and classroom performance data demonstrating the need for more targeted instruction to meet diverse student needs. The priority that should be addressed first is reading proficiency, particularly for students in the lowest 25% and those in kindergarten, because strong literacy skills are foundational to success across all academic subjects. Improving reading outcomes early can positively impact student performance in mathematics, science, and other content areas while reducing future achievement gaps.

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

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

Area of Focus #1

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

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD), Black/ African American Students (BLK)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

According to the 2026 FAST PM3, 38% of Black/African American students and 37% of Students with Disabilities scored below grade level. Based on the data and the identified contributing factor of a lack of targeted learning, for the 2026–2027 school year, we will implement the Targeted Element of Differentiated Instruction to increase ELA proficiency to 40% in both subgroups.

Measurable Outcome

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

According to the 2026 FAST PM3 in English Language Arts, 38% of Black/African American students and 37% of Students with Disabilities scored below grade level. Based on the data and the identified contributing factor of a lack of targeted learning, for the 2026–2027 school year, we will implement the Targeted Element of Differentiated Instruction to increase overall ELA proficiency to higher than 40% in both subgroups.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored using progress monitoring checks. In addition, the administrative team will conduct walkthroughs to ensure differentiated instruction is implemented throughout the year. Below are detailed steps to implement monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Chris Penedo and Isha Brown

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the

evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:
Teacher-Directed Small-Group Literacy Intervention is an evidence-based instructional approach that provides struggling readers with intensive, systematic, and explicit instruction in foundational literacy skills, including phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Instruction is delivered daily in small groups with teacher-directed modeling, scaffolded support, corrective feedback, and repeated opportunities for guided and independent practice. This practice aligns with the What Works Clearinghouse guidance emphasizing the importance of strong Tier 1 literacy instruction and targeted Tier 2 intervention for students who continue to struggle despite receiving appropriate core instruction. Direct Link: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/english_learners_pg_040114.pdf#page=38

Rationale:
We will be using Differentiated Instruction to support the needs of all students. This ongoing strategy will ensure teachers are aligning instruction to all relevant data.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Subgroup Data Disaggregation & Small-Group Roster Assignment

Person Monitoring:
Chris Penedo, Isha Brown, Teachers

By When/Frequency:
August 10, 2026–September 25, 2026, once

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Disaggregate 2026 FAST PM3 and baseline diagnostic data (i-Ready/FAST PM1) specifically for Black/African American students and Students with Disabilities (SWD). Map students directly into targeted Tier 2/Tier 3 small groups to utilize the designated intervention times within the established master schedule.

Action Step #2
PD on Explicit Small-Group Scaffolding & IEP Alignment

Person Monitoring:
Chris Penedo, Isha Brown, Teachers

By When/Frequency:
August 10, 2026–September 25, 2026, once

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Deliver targeted professional development for general education and ESE/co-teachers on conducting explicit, systematic small-group lessons (modeling, guided practice, immediate corrective feedback). Focus on aligning small-group accommodations directly with IEP goals for Students with Disabilities and utilizing culturally responsive scaffolded materials.

Action Step #3
Full Rollout of Flexible Differentiated Groups & Explicit Routines

Person Monitoring:
Chris Penedo, Isha Brown, Teachers

By When/Frequency:
August 10, 2026–September 25, 2026, daily

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Implement daily teacher-directed small groups focused on foundational literacy gaps (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, or comprehension based on diagnostic needs). Utilize flexible grouping strategies so students receive explicit modeling, scaffolded prompts, and repeated opportunities for guided reading practice.

Area of Focus #2

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

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

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

According to the 2026 Early Literacy STAR Assessment, 67% of the Kindergarten learners scored below Level 3 for proficiency. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of mastery in the tested benchmarks Paragraph-Level Comprehension and Structural Analysis, we will implement the Targeted Element Making Text Connections to improve student learning.

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

Data from the 2026 Early Literacy STAR Assessment, 67% of the Kindergarten learners scored below Level 3 for proficiency. Based on the data, we will implement the Targeted element of Making Text Connections as it relates to ELA

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

Data from the 2026 FAST PM3 Assessment shows that 59% of third-grade students, 69% of fourth-grade students, and 62% of fifth-grade students demonstrated proficiency. Among our lowest 25% of students, 59% demonstrated proficiency. Based on these data, we will implement the Targeted element of Making Text Connections to strengthen students' ELA skills and improve overall proficiency.

Grades K-2: Measurable Outcome(s)

With the implementation of the Targeted Element of Making Text Connections as it relates to ELA, Kindergarten - second grade students will increase ELA proficiency by 3 percentage points as

evidenced by the 2027 FAST PM3 STAR Literacy/Reading assessment

Grades 3-5: Measurable Outcome(s)

By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, the percentage of students in the Lowest 25% demonstrating proficiency in ELA will increase by at least 3 percentage points, as measured by the 2027 FAST PM3 Assessment, through the implementation of the Targeted element of Making Text Connections.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored using progress monitoring checks. In addition, the administrative team will conduct walkthroughs to ensure Making Text Connections is implemented throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Chris Penedo and Isha Brown

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Making Text Connections is a reading comprehension strategy that helps students construct meaning by connecting new information to their prior knowledge and experiences. Students learn to make Text-to-Self, Text-to-Text, and Text-to-World connections to deepen comprehension, increase engagement, and enhance critical thinking while reading. By actively linking ideas across texts and experiences, students develop a stronger understanding of content and improve retention of information.

Rationale:

We will be using Making Text Connections to support the needs of all students. This ongoing strategy will ensure teachers are aligning instruction to all relevant data.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Establish Baseline Data & Targeted Small-Group Rosters

Person Monitoring:
Chris Penedo, Isha Brown, Teachers

By When/Frequency:
August 10, 2026–September 25, 2026, once

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Analyze the 2026 Early Literacy STAR Assessment data to identify specific sub-skills in Structural Analysis and Paragraph-Level Comprehension. Group the 67% of students scoring below Level 3 into targeted, flexible Tier 2/Tier 3 intervention groups for daily small-group instruction.

Action Step #2
Professional Development on Visual Anchor Charts & Verbal Stem Explicit Modeling

Person Monitoring:
Chris Penedo, Isha Brown, Teachers

By When/Frequency:
August 10, 2026–September 25, 2026, once

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Conduct targeted professional development for Kindergarten and first-grade teachers and interventionists on teaching Making Text Connections to emergent readers. Focus on explicit modeling (Think-Alouds) using visual anchor charts (icons for Text-to-Self, Text-to-Text, Text-to-World) and sentence frames (e.g., "This part reminds me of...").

Action Step #3
Launch Tier 1 Core & Tier 2 Small-Group Text-to-Self Connections

Person Monitoring:
Chris Penedo, Isha Brown

By When/Frequency:
August 10, 2026–September 25, 2026, daily

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Begin explicit instruction of Text-to-Self connections during daily interactive read-alouds and guided reading groups. Students will use graphic organizers, picture cards, and verbal responses to relate character feelings and plot events in read-aloud texts to their own personal experiences.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Positive Behavior and Intervention System (PBIS)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

According to the 2025-2026 School Disciplinary Data Report, there were 17% percent of student with two or more referrals in middle school. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of the direct correlation between behavior and achievement, we will implement the Positive Behavior and Intervention System.

Measurable Outcome

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

With the implementation of the Positive Behavior and Intervention System, the percentage of students with two or more disciplinary scams will decrease to 10% as evidenced by the Disciplinary Referral Summary by June 2027.

Monitoring

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

The area of focus will be monitored by the administration. The administration, as well as the student services team, will create a plan to monitor and provide support with fidelity. Incentives will be used to motivate and inspire students to promote positive behaviors.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Chris Penedo and Isha Brown

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Positive Behavior Support (PBS) is a proactive, schoolwide framework designed to establish and reinforce positive student behaviors through clearly defined expectations, direct instruction, consistent acknowledgment systems, and data-driven decision-making. PBS focuses on prevention rather than punishment by creating supportive environments that teach and reinforce appropriate behaviors across all school settings, including classrooms, hallways, cafeterias, buses, and extracurricular activities. The framework promotes academic success, social-emotional development, and positive school climate through a continuum of supports for all students.

Rationale:

Within the target element of PBS, our school will focus on implementing a consistent, schoolwide system that proactively promotes positive behavior across all settings. This approach consistently reinforces appropriate behaviors to create a supportive and safe school environment. Rather than relying solely on individual behavior plans, we will establish a comprehensive framework that supports all students in classrooms and common areas.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3

action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Form PBIS Leadership Team & Define Middle School Expectations Matrix

Person Monitoring:
Chris Penedo and Isha Brown

By When/Frequency:
August 10, 2026-Septemeber 25, 2026, once

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Establish a dedicated Middle School PBIS Leadership Team (administration, grade-level counselors, dean, and middle school teachers). Develop and finalize a clear, multi-setting Expectations Matrix (e.g., Be Respectful, Be Responsible, Be Safe) specifying expected behaviors in classrooms, hallways, cafeteria, restrooms, and during transition periods.

Action Step #2
Staff Professional Development & Acknowledgment System Design

Person Monitoring:
Chris Penedo and Isha Brown

By When/Frequency:
August 10, 2026-Septemeber 25, 2026, once

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Conduct professional development for all middle school staff on PBIS principles, shift from punitive to preventative practices, and standardizing minor vs. major behavioral definitions. Design a tangible/digital positive acknowledgment system (e.g., PBIS reward points, school store access, monthly incentive events) to immediately recognize positive student behavior.

Action Step #3
Explicit Student Behavior Lessons & Schoolwide Rollout

Person Monitoring:
Isha Brown, Marlissa Rodriguez

By When/Frequency:
August 10, 2026-Septemeber 25, 2026, once

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Roll out the PBIS framework to middle school students during homeroom/advisory and assembly periods. Direct-teach behavioral expectations across settings using explicit lesson plans, student role-playing, and visual signage posted in key transition areas throughout the middle school wing.

Area of Focus #2

Student Retentions

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

South Miami Feeder Pattern Goal: Student Enrollment

The Area of Focus was identified as a crucial strategic need following a comparative review of July budgeted enrollment data from the 2025–2026 and 2026–2027 school years, which revealed a loss of

94 students that creates a compounding challenge of reduced district allocations and limited instructional support. Addressing this decline through targeted recruitment, family engagement, and the active marketing of South Miami K-8 Center's specialized academic programs is essential to stabilizing class sizes, restoring resources, maintaining vibrant elective and sports opportunities, and fostering long-term academic sustainability across all grade levels.

Measurable Outcome

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

According to the July budgeted enrollment data, South Miami K-8 Center experienced a decline from 477 students in 2025 to 383 students in 2026 (a loss of 94 students, leaving elementary grades with 2 sections per grade level in K–4 and middle school averaging 42 students per grade level). By June 2027, the school will increase total enrollment by 8% (a net gain of 31 students, bringing total enrollment to at least 414 students) as evidenced by the Official District October FTE Count and June Enrollment Reports. This growth will be driven by increasing incoming Kindergarten and primary enrollment to an average of 22+ students per section (minimum 44 students per grade level in K–2), maintaining a student retention rate of 95% or higher across grades 3–5, and boosting middle school enrollment from 42 to at least 50 students per grade level (150+ total middle school students) through targeted feeder-pattern recruitment and program promotion.

Monitoring

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact through bi-weekly School Leadership Team meetings where the Principal, Assistant Principal, Registrar, and Community Involvement Specialist will review the Recruitment and Retention Log to track marketing initiatives, feeder-pattern school visits, neighborhood outreach, and social media campaigns. Implementation fidelity will be maintained through weekly audits of incoming registration packets and exit interview logs to address withdrawal trends immediately, while impact toward the target of 414 students (an 8% increase) will be evaluated using active monthly roster counts, official District FTE Survey 2 (October) and Survey 3 (February) reports, and quarterly 5th-to-6th grade retention checks. If progress monitoring indicates lagging enrollment in specific grade bands, the team will adjust recruitment strategies, schedule targeted open house events, and leverage EESAC community partnerships to ensure South Miami K-8 Center meets its growth benchmarks by June 2027.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Chris Penedo, Isha Brown

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:
Welcoming Spaces are intentionally designed physical environments that promote comfort, belonging, engagement, and positive interactions among students, staff, families, and visitors. These spaces reflect the school's culture, values, and commitment to creating an inclusive learning environment. Through thoughtful design, student involvement, and attention to aesthetics and functionality, welcoming spaces foster school connectedness, emotional well-being, and a positive school climate.

Rationale:
Within the targeted element of Welcoming Spaces, our school will focus on promoting comfort, belonging, engagement, and positive interactions among students, staff, families, and visitors, and this should aid in increasing our enrollment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:
Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1
Launch 'Discover South Miami K-8' Branding & Digital Campaign

Person Monitoring:
Chris Penedo, Isha Brown

By When/Frequency:
August 10, 2026-Septemeber 25, 2026, once

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Establish a dedicated Recruitment Committee (Administration, Registrar, CIS, and EESAC parent lead) to develop marketing collateral highlighting the school’s academic successes, early literacy initiatives, and middle school electives. Roll out a targeted social media campaign and update the school website with virtual campus tours and easy digital registration links.

Action Step #2
Initiate Feeder Preschool & Early Learning Center Partnerships

Person Monitoring:
Chris Penedo, Isha Brown

By When/Frequency:
August 10, 2026-Septemeber 25, 2026, once

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Establish direct outreach with local South Miami early learning centers, private preschools, and daycare providers. Distribute "Kindergarten Readiness" informational packets and schedule fall site visits to invite prospective families to tour South Miami K-8's primary classrooms.

Action Step #3
Analyze October FTE Count & Host Fall Community Open House

Person Monitoring:
Chris Penedo , Isha Brown

By When/Frequency:
August 10, 2026-Septemeber 25, 2026, once

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:
Review official District FTE Survey from the previous year's data to assess initial enrollment numbers against baseline targets. Host a prospective family "Fall Open House & Showcase" featuring guided campus tours, classroom visits, and student work displays to capture late-fall enrollments and neighborhood transfers.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (ESEA Section 1114(b)). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership, and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

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

No Answer Entered

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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

List the school's webpage where the school's Parental Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

No Answer Entered

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

No Answer Entered

How Plan is Developed

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other federal, state and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, 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) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections

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

No Answer Entered

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

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

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

No Answer Entered

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

No Answer Entered

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

No Answer Entered

Professional Learning and Other Activities

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high-need subjects (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

No Answer Entered

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

No Answer Entered

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

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

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

To effectively address student needs for the 2026–2027 school year, our school leadership team collaborates with district ELA specialists in a structured, data-driven resource review process using baseline data from the 2026 FAST PM3 assessment. This review identified a critical need for targeted learning among our 3rd through 8th-grade students, specifically highlighting that 15% of our lowest 25% scored at Level 1, while 38% of Black/African American students and 37% of Students with Disabilities scored below grade level. In response, the school and district realign instructional resources, intervention materials, and professional development to directly support the Targeted Element of Differentiated Instruction in Reading. Throughout the school year, leadership and district personnel conduct progress-monitoring checkpoints using FAST PM1 and PM2 data to evaluate the impact of these allocated resources toward reaching our target outcomes—increasing subgroup proficiency to higher than 40% and reducing Level 1 students to 12%—allowing us to dynamically reallocate coaching support, intervention schedules, and supplemental Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading materials whenever necessary.

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

For the 2026–2027 school year, our school will utilize Differentiated Instruction in Reading resources—including targeted small-group reading toolkits, Tier 2 and Tier 3 supplemental intervention programs, ELA instructional coaching support, and ongoing progress-monitoring tools—to address the identified need for targeted learning in grades 3 through 8. The rationale for allocating these specific resources is based on 2026 FAST PM3 baseline data, which revealed that 15% of students scored at Level 1 (lowest 25%), while 38% of Black/African American students and 37% of Students with Disabilities scored below grade level. Across the 2026–2027 timeline—monitored during dedicated daily reading blocks and evaluated quarterly via FAST PM1 (Fall), PM2 (Winter), and PM3 (Spring)—these resources will be deployed to increase ELA proficiency to higher than 40% for both Black/African American students and Students with Disabilities, while reducing the percentage of Level 1 students to 12% (achieving 66% proficiency among our lowest 25% learners).

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2026-27 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply. **No**

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00