Miramar High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Miramar High School

3601 SW 89TH AVE, M IR Amar, FL 33025

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Maria Formoso

Start Date for this Principal: 9/6/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Miramar High School

3601 SW 89TH AVE, M IR Amar, FL 33025

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	72%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	96%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

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 Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Miramar High School will provide a strong foundation for students to reach their ultimate potential through comprehensive curricula, rigorous standards and comprehensive assessments. The educational standards at Miramar High School, home to the International Baccalaureate and Aviation Magnet Programs, will foster cultural awareness and understanding so that graduates will be compassionate and independent thinkers in an emerging global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Miramar High school is achieving excellence in education for 21st century learners through college and career readiness, while supporting social emotional needs.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Formoso, Maria	Principal	Oversees implementation of School Improvement Plan.
Bergeron, Kaila	Assistant Principal	Oversees teachers that work with students with disabilities on science skills; ensures students receive the services they need.
Fernandez, Jason	Teacher, K-12	SAC Co-Chair Drafts SIP
Francois, Alexander	Assistant Principal	Oversees social studies teachers that work with students on literacy skills; ensures students receive the services they need.
Murray, John	Assistant Principal	Oversees ESE teachers that work with students with disabilities on social skills and curriculum; ensures students receive the services they need.
Selvidge, Cristina	Assistant Principal	Oversees math teachers that work with students with disabilities on math skills; ensures students receive the services they need.
Winter, Shelly	Assistant Principal	Oversees English and reading teachers that work with students on literacy skills; ensures students receive the services they need.
Williams, Jonell	Reading Coach	SAC Co-Chair Drafts SIP

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 9/6/2014, Maria Formoso

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

54

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

102

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,088

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523	549	520	515	2107
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	77	72	83	327
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	83	89	250
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/14/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523	549	520	515	2107
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	77	72	83	327
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	83	89	250
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	22	46	108
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152	132	136	121	541
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	142	79	180	539

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	14	0	30

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	2	3	18

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523	549	520	515		2107
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	77	72	83		327
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	83	89		250
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	22	46		108
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152	132	136	121		541
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	142	79	180		539

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	14	0		30

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	2	3		18

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				41%	57%	56%	44%	58%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	52%	51%	47%	54%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	45%	42%	40%	47%	44%
Math Achievement				29%	51%	51%	30%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains				34%	44%	48%	30%	45%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				25%	43%	45%	25%	46%	45%
Science Achievement				50%	66%	68%	43%	64%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				66%	71%	73%	65%	70%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2021					
	2019	39%	57%	-18%	55%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	39%	53%	-14%	53%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	49%	67%	-18%	67%	-18%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	65%	67%	-2%	70%	-5%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	23%	61%	-38%	61%	-38%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	29%	56%	-27%	57%	-28%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

English teachers used USA Test Prep, Reading teachers used the FAIR, Geometry teachers used Mastery Connect, Algebra teachers used Aleks, Biology teachers used Canvas quizzes and American History teachers used Quia to progress monitor individual students. Data was compiled by student and class period not by grade level, economic disadvantage, disability or language proficiency therefore the chart below can't be completed.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	17	31	21	6	23	35	15	24		87	33
ELL	17	42	46	7	19	21	27	43		90	75
ASN	73	85		55	30			70		100	93
BLK	38	43	42	9	16	29	34	45		96	65
HSP	32	39	22	14	27	39	29	58		88	78

2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
MUL					20					91	90
WHT	56	49		28	8		47	50		93	77
FRL	36	42	35	10	16	30	32	44		94	66

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	19	36	25	24	23	23	14	47		92	51
ELL	34	43	33	28	42	42	40	42		86	73
ASN	93	71		83	47		95	90		100	85
BLK	36	43	39	25	30	23	45	65		94	82
HSP	48	54	55	35	39	40	56	66		97	82
MUL	82	55		33	50		91			87	100
WHT	54	57		46	69		42	79		100	75
FRL	38	45	42	27	34	25	47	64		94	81

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	26	39	32	26	27	19	27	44		69	45
ELL	21	48	44	33	50	40	48	28		89	66
ASN	88	85						77		97	87
BLK	40	45	40	26	26	25	37	63		92	79
HSP	55	48	43	40	41	31	71	70		93	90
MUL	63	50		27	40			80		100	77
WHT	68	38		62	36		64	77			
FRL	42	45	39	29	30	25	42	64		91	80

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	466
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	89%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	72
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Other than the American History EOC between 50% & 70% of the students lack proficiency in tested areas.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Students achievement scores were lowest on the FSA ELA 9 & 10 and the Algebra EOC.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Many students lack testing stamina and test taking strategies to meet with success. Students also lack mastery of key concepts needed to achieve a level three score or higher on state assessments. Students need intensive support in math and literacy. Many Algebra and ELA need to be double blocked for math and literacy support.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science achievement scores reflect most improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The science department engaged in professional development that focused on integrating literacy skills when teaching their curriculum. Teachers emphasized the importance of vocabulary mastery and promoted the use of effect testing taking strategies.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

1. Monitor student progress in core areas utilizing common formative assessments.
2. Provide remediation for students that show deficiency on common formative assessments.
3. Increase academic support for students in their ELA & math courses.

4. Promote literacy as well as college and career readiness through elective courses.
5. Ensure students are socially and emotionally supported to meet with academic success.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will receive PD during preplanning week, professional study days, early release days and planning days. Teachers will also receive PD during monthly meetings held during their planning period or afterschool for those individuals that do not have a planning period. PD will focus on reading strategies, engagement strategies SEL techniques and tech tools that can support students and instruction.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Students are also receiving additional support in algebra and literacy through pullouts from their elective classes and afterschool tutoring programs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with disabilities struggle to synthesize information across multiple subjects, through various platforms. Additionally, they do not perform well on high stakes testing.
Measurable Outcome:	9th and 10th grade students with disabilities will demonstrate 41% proficiency in English/ Language Arts and math as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment administered in May 2022.
Monitoring:	Student progress in ELA will be progress monitored by teachers utilizing System 44 and Read 180.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	John Murray (john.murray@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to accommodate students with disabilities, we will attempt to break material down into smaller segments, in small group settings. We will utilize various instructional methods such as scaffolding and chunking to assist students in attaining master of previously taught material. Periodically students will be tested to assess their level of mastery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale is based on data scores that reflect success of reinforcing material through small group instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor student progress in core areas utilizing common formative assessments.
2. Provide remediation for students that show deficiency on common formative assessments.
3. Increase academic support for students in their ELA courses.
4. Promote literacy as well as college and career readiness through elective courses.
5. Ensure students are socially and emotionally supported to meet with academic success.

Person Responsible	John Murray (john.murray@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A majority of Miramar students struggle with literacy skills such as the identification of key ideas and details, integration of knowledge, analysis of craft and structure, utilization of proper grammar as well as correct usage of language and editing which are the five standards tested on the ELA FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	9th and 10th grade students will demonstrate 45% proficiency in English/language Arts as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment administered in May of 2022.
Monitoring:	Student progress in ELA will be progress monitored by teachers utilizing System 44 and Read 180.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shelly Winter (shelly.winter@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standard-based Instructional Focus Guides will be created that aligned to instruction to grade-level standards. Common formative assessments will be administered to monitor success of plan implementation. Remediation will be provided to target deficiency in students that lack proficiency in mastery of the standards..
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for this strategy is based on data scores that reflect success of curriculum alignment as well as the use of common formative assessments to monitor student mastery as a result of of curriculum alignment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor student progress in core areas utilizing common formative assessments.
2. Provide remediation for students that show deficiency on common formative assessments.
3. Increase academic support for students in their ELA.
4. Promote literacy as well as college and career readiness through elective courses.
5. Ensure students are socially and emotionally supported to meet with academic success.

Person Responsible Shelly Winter (shelly.winter@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The school does the following to build a positive school culture and environment:
-Highlights staff in the weekly Faculty Newsletter
-Sends out monthly newsletter to parents
-Holds monthly Kids of Character Celebrations
-Recognizes of Patriot Scholars during daily announcements
-Celebrates students on school website
-Celebrates students on Principal's Twitter account

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Administrators
Curriculum leaders
Magnet Coordinators
Club Sponsors
Athletic Coaches

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3610	910-To General Fund	1751 - Miramar High School	School Improvement Funds		$1,000.00
			Notes: Will utilize funds for professional development as needed for teacher to meet student needs.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22

	3610	910-To General Fund	1751 - Miramar High School	School Improvement Funds		$1,000.00
			Notes: Will utilize funds for professional development as needed for teacher to meet student needs.			
					Total:	$2,000.00