Southwest Miami Senior High

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Southwest Miami Senior High

8855 SW 50TH TER, Miami, FL 33165

http://sweagles.dadeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Jorge Bulnes

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2017

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	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (54%)
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 Dade 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

Southwest Miami Senior High

8855 SW 50TH TER, Miami, FL 33165

http://sweagles.dadeschools.net/

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	Yes	78%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	97%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade 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.

We serve all stakeholders by building the intellect and ethics of our students so they may be productive members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We challenge, empower, and prepare all for success.

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
Bulnes, Jorge	Principal	Dr. Rios participates as an active member of the Professional Learning Support Team, reviews SIP with all stakeholders, and oversees and assists with the implementation of the action steps.
Gonzalez, Jose	Assistant Principal	Mr. Gonzalez is the administrator who oversees school curriculum and advanced academic programs, including dual enrollment and advanced placement. He also oversees and assists with the implementation of the action steps.
Hass, Kerrie	Teacher, K-12	Dr. Hass participates as an active member of the Professional Learning Support Team and assists with the implementation of the action steps. She is also an English Language Arts, an Advanced Placement Capstone, and Dual Enrollment teacher. Dr. Hass serves as our English Language Arts Department Chairperson.
Casanas, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Casanas participates as an active member of the Professional Learning Support Team and assists with the implementation of the action steps. She is also an Exceptional Students Education and Math teacher.
Singler, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Singler is our Science Department Chairperson. She teaches Advanced Placement, Biology, and Chemistry. She also participates as an active member of the Professional Learning Support Team and assists with the implementation of the action steps.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/19/2017, Jorge Bulnes

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.*

41

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.*

65

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

112

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,295

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

1

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

1

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	571	586	597	541	2295
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	112	122	96	420
One or more suspensions	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	13	101	80	39	233
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	168	85	96	379
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	125	96	137	460
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	121	121	142	500
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	260	0	0	0	260

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	99	177	149	166	591

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	1	1	1	24	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	13	23

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/19/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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	607	645	578	628	2458
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	121	99	108	441
One or more suspensions	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	102	80	39	5	226
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167	84	99	4	354
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	97	142	127	491
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	121	141	155	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	180	149	160	130	619

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	1	1	1	24	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	17	27

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				49%	59%	56%	51%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	54%	51%	51%	56%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	48%	42%	41%	51%	44%
Math Achievement				41%	54%	51%	49%	51%	51%
Math Learning Gains				42%	52%	48%	53%	50%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	51%	45%	50%	51%	45%
Science Achievement				60%	68%	68%	57%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				68%	76%	73%	64%	73%	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	46%	55%	-9%	55%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	47%	53%	-6%	53%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

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	57%	68%	-11%	67%	-10%
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	66%	71%	-5%	70%	-4%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	35%	63%	-28%	61%	-26%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	43%	54%	-11%	57%	-14%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tools used to compile data were mid-year assessments for the 2020-21 school year and data from Power BI.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	50	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	48	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	30	0
	English Language Learners	0	8	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	53	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	53	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	43	0
	English Language Learners	0	43	0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0	45	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	42	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	13	0
	English Language Learners	0	16	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	30	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	29	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	9	0
	English Language Learners	0	26	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	0	5	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	5	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	3	0
	English Language Learners	0	3	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	0	68	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	66	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	40	0
	English Language Learners	0	37	0

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

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	25	21	14	22	25	22	30	39		97	28
ELL	19	26	21	14	20	23	33	45		98	74
HSP	40	31	20	20	17	22	43	61		97	69
WHT	60	41		33	17		40	79		100	61
FRL	38	31	20	20	17	21	40	58		97	69

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	27	34	20	24	42	36	43	46		87	41
ELL	29	44	40	36	43	39	47	48		92	87
BLK	38	44		31	46						
HSP	49	45	35	40	42	41	59	69		93	77
WHT	63	51		55	47		84	64		93	76
FRL	47	45	36	39	41	39	57	65		93	77
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	21	31	23	23	41	42	29	32		84	40
ELL	24	48	51	39	51	52	42	27		86	77
BLK	29	44		33	21						
HSP	51	50	41	49	53	51	58	63		90	70
WHT	57	60	40	44	61	50	60	82		82	57
FRL	50	49	41	49	53	50	56	59		89	69

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	54
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	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

2019: The 9th grade ELA data show we are nine percent below the district and state average .

The 10th grade ELA data show we are six percent below the district and state average .

The Algebra I data show we are 28 percent below the district average and 26 percent below the state.

The Biology data show we are 11 percent below the district average and ten percent below the state.

The US History data show we are five percent below the district average and four percent below the state.

ELL subgroup data show 29 percent overall achievement, 44 percent overall learning gains, and 40 percent learning gains in the lowest 25 percent population on the 2019 ELA FSA. The data show 36 percent overall achievement, 43 percent overall learning gains, and 39 percent learning gains in the lowest 25 percent population on the 2019 Math FSA EOC. ELL students performed similarly with 47 percent achievement in Biology and 48 percent achievement in U.S. History.

One trend is that SWD and ELL students score similarly in Math, Science, and Social Studies; however, the difference in scores on the FSA ELA is significant with ELL students making higher learning gains than SWD.

2021: The only trend evident in the 2021 data is an overall decrease in every subgroup.
The largest decrease is in mathematics with a 24 percent decrease in proficiency, 24 percent decrease in learning gains, and a 15 percent decrease in proficiency in lowest 25 percent population.

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

2019: According to the 2019 data, students scored 28 percent lower than the district and 26 percent lower than the state on the Algebra I EOC. This would be our greatest area of need.
2021: According to the 2021 data, there was a 24 percent decrease in the Algebra I proficiency and a 24 percent decrease in learning gains.
According to the 2021 data, there was a ten percent decrease in FSA ELA proficiency and a 14 percent decrease in learning gains.
According to the 2021 data, there was a seven percent decrease in U.S. History proficiency.
According to the 2021 data, there was a 19 percent decrease in Biology proficiency.

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

2019: Some students enter high school with learning gaps in mathematics. We attempted to implement an Algebra I A/B course for students in the lowest 25 percent; however, scheduling conflicts did not allow for some students to take both courses.

New actions that would need to be taken: Assuring that students in the lowest 25 percent are enrolled in both Algebra I A and B courses, interventions need to be in place at the start of the year, tutoring should be available after school, progress monitoring in small groups within the classes will assure students' individual needs are being met.

2021: Due to a large majority of our students choosing MSO, there was a lack of engagement and accountability. Although additional tutoring was provided, online sessions were not well-attended. Additionally, there was no hands-on learning such as science labs for any student due to COVID restrictions.

New actions that would need to be taken: Assuming that students will be returning to the building for face-to-face instruction, we anticipate an increase in student engagement. Additionally, after school tutoring and Saturday Academy will be face-to-face this year to provide intervention and support for students who are struggling academically.

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

2019: The largest gains were in Science and Social Studies achievement with 14 percent each in the SWD subgroup.
2021: The 2021 state assessments show no improvement in any component.

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

2019: Some contributing factors: Research course, Biology lab, common planning, and district support (strategies and tools).
2021: The 2021 state assessments show no improvement in any component.

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

The evidence-based strategy chosen is Universal Design for Learning (UDL). Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is a scientifically valid framework for guiding educational practice that provides flexibility in how information is presented, in how students respond or demonstrate knowledge and skills, and in how students are engaged. It reduces barriers in instruction, provides appropriate accommodations, supports, and challenges, and maintains high achievement expectations for all students, including students with disabilities and students who are Limited English Proficient.

The evidence-based strategy chosen is Standards-Based Collaborative Planning. Standards-Based Collaborative Planning refers to any period of time that is scheduled during the school day for multiple teachers, or teams of teachers, to work together. Its primary purpose is to bring teachers together to learn from one another and collaborate on projects that will lead to improvements in standards-aligned lesson quality, instructional effectiveness, and student achievement. Standards-Based lessons should include detailed objectives, activities and assessments that evaluate students on the aligned standards-based content. Collaborative Planning improves collaboration among teachers and promotes learning, insights, and constructive feedback that occur during professional discussions

among teachers. Standards-Based lessons, units, materials, and resources are improved when teachers work on them collaboratively.

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.

Professional development will be implemented in the areas of UDL and Data Chats.

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

Constant evaluation and reflection on services that will be implemented will assure sustainability of improvement in the school year and beyond.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The ELA data show that we were 15 percent below the district average in 2019 and are 17 percent below the district average in 2021. The Mathematics data show that we were 21 percent below the district average in 2019 and are 29 percent below the district average in 2021. The Science data show that we were 2 percent above the district average in 2019 and are 8 percent below the district average in 2021. The Social Studies data show that we were 6 percent below the district average in 2019 and are 2 percent below the district average in 2021. Our ELL subgroup data showed 29 percent overall achievement, 44 percent overall learning gains, and 40 percent learning gains in the lowest 25 percent population on the 2019 ELA FSA. For the 2021 ELA FSA, the ELL subgroup data show a 12 percent overall achievement, 44 percent overall learning gains, and 42 percent learning gains in the lowest 25 percent population. Similarly, the data show 36 percent overall achievement, 43 percent overall learning gains, and 39 percent learning gains in the lowest 25 percent population on the 2019 Math FSA EOC. The ELL subgroup data show 26 percent overall achievement, 38 percent overall learning gains, and 39 percent learning gains in the lowest 25 percent population on the 2021 Math FSA EOC. One trend that is evident is that SWD and ELL students score similarly in Math, Science, and Social Studies; however, the difference in scores on the FSA ELA is significant with ELL students making higher learning gains than SWD.
Measurable Outcome:	Two professional development opportunities will be provided for teachers on the PD non-opt days, August 19th and October 29th. Our goal is to train 100% of our faculty in the areas of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Collaborative Data Chats.
Monitoring:	Professional development sign-in sheets and evaluations on My Learning Plan will be monitored. Additionally, we will conduct administrative walk-throughs to look for evidence of UDL and have informal conversations with students to determine ownership of their data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Janelle Bravo-San Pedro (jbravosanpedro@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy chosen is Universal Design for Learning (UDL). Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is a scientifically valid framework for guiding educational practice that provides flexibility in how information is presented, in how students respond or demonstrate knowledge and skills, and in how students are engaged. It reduces barriers in instruction, provides appropriate accommodations, supports, and challenges, and maintains high achievement expectations for all students, including students with disabilities and students who are Limited English Proficient.
Rationale for Evidence-	Implementing UDL meets the needs of all learners. It encompasses flexibility, differentiation, student engagement, support, and accommodations.

based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

7/21- 8/10 - Create Professional Learning opportunity on the Universal Design for Learning. As a result, teachers will engage in meaningful activities geared toward the implementation of this framework for instruction and learning.

Person Responsible   Kimberly Casanas (331604@dadeschools.net)

8/10- Schedule and propose PD on My Learning Plan and meet with PLST and presenters to review the Professional Development activities that will be presented on August 19, 2021. As a result of this meeting, the PLST members will review the agenda for August 19, 2021 to assure that quality presentations and activities will be utilized. Any changes that need to be made to guarantee engaging and informative activities will be made by the PLST.

Person Responsible   Kerrie Hass (klmalone@dadeschools.net)

8/19- The PLST members, along with the designated presenters, will facilitate the presentation and activities on August 19, 2021. As a result of this professional development, participants will understand the UDL framework for teaching and learning and be able to implement such practices in their classes.

Person Responsible   Kimberly Casanas (331604@dadeschools.net)

8/19- 9/3 - Participants from the UDL professional development will complete the PD evaluation, providing information about how they have implemented the UDL framework in their classes. As a result, the PLST will receive feedback on the Professional Development session and participants will detail changes in their instructional practices as a result of this professional development.

Person Responsible   Kerrie Hass (klmalone@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17 - Administration will perform informal walkthroughs to assess the adoption and implementation of UDL frameworks within classrooms. Administrators will meet with the CST/PLST team to verify that the UDL frameworks observed are consistent with concepts presented within the early year professional developments.

Person Responsible   Jose Gonzalez (jmgonzalez@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17 - Departments will share best UDL practices and pedagogies during departmental meetings. Administrators will also frequently attend meetings to observe and provide feedback about the presence of the UDL frameworks within classrooms.

Person Responsible   Jose Gonzalez (jmgonzalez@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The ELA data show that we were 15 percent below the district average in 2019 and are 17 percent below the district average in 2021. The Mathematics data show that we were 21 percent below the district average in 2019 and are 29 percent below the district average in 2021. The Science data show that we were 2 percent above the district average in 2019 and are 8 percent below the district average in 2021. The Social Studies data show that we were 6 percent below the district average in 2019 and are 2 percent below the district average in 2021. Our ELL subgroup data showed 29 percent overall achievement, 44 percent overall learning gains, and 40 percent learning gains in the lowest 25 percent population on the 2019 ELA FSA. For the 2021 ELA FSA, the ELL subgroup data show a 12 percent overall achievement, 44 percent overall learning gains, and 42 percent learning gains in the lowest 25 percent population. Similarly, the data show 36 percent overall achievement, 43 percent overall learning gains, and 39 percent learning gains in the lowest 25 percent population on the 2019 Math FSA EOC. The ELL subgroup data show 26 percent overall achievement, 38 percent overall learning gains, and 39 percent learning gains in the lowest 25 percent population on the 2021 Math FSA EOC. One trend that is evident is that SWD and ELL students score similarly in Math, Science, and Social Studies; however, the difference in scores on the FSA ELA is significant with ELL students making higher learning gains than SWD.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal is to have a minimum of one common planning meeting per grade level/subject area each month. This will be monitored by the school administrator designated to oversee each department.
Monitoring:	The administrator who oversees each department will attend the common planning meetings. Evidence of common planning will be visible in lesson plans and through sign-in sheets and meeting minutes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy chosen is Standards-Based Collaborative Planning. Standards-Based Collaborative Planning refers to any period of time that is scheduled during the school day for multiple teachers, or teams of teachers, to work together. Its primary purpose is to bring teachers together to learn from one another and collaborate on projects that will lead to improvements in standards-aligned lesson quality, instructional effectiveness, and student achievement. Standards-Based lessons should include detailed objectives, activities and assessments that evaluate students on the aligned standards-based content. Collaborative Planning improves collaboration among teachers and promotes learning, insights, and constructive feedback that occur during professional discussions among teachers. Standards-Based lessons, units, materials, and resources are improved when teachers work on them collaboratively.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative planning meets the needs of the unique learners at our school. It will allow teachers to work together to share best practices, monitor student progress, and provide differentiated instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

8/20 - Curriculum Leaders will meet with department members to create a calendar for common planning. As avresult of the creation of this calendar, grade level/subject area common planning meeting times will be shared with the administration/instructional coaches to assure that an administrator/instructional coach is present at some meetings to assist with common planning.

Person Responsible   Janelle Bravo-San Pedro (jbravosanpedro@dadeschools.net)

8/23 - 10/28 - Common planning will take place during the designated days/times for ecah grade level/ subject area. As a result of the common planning sessions, grade level/subject area teachers will share best practices, plan together utilizing the pacing guides, work to align all activities and assessments to the Florida Standards.

Person Responsible   Janelle Bravo-San Pedro (jbravosanpedro@dadeschools.net)

8/23 - 10/28 - Administrators/instructional coaches will attend and monitor common planning on a monthly basis. As a result, administrators/instructional coaches will be more aware of the instruction taking place in the classroom and insure that quality instruction based on the Florida Standards is being delivered.

Person Responsible   Jorge Bulnes (pr7741@dadeschools.net)

8/23- 10/28 - Administrators/instructional coaches will meet monthly with curriculum leaders for each department to discuss data. Curriculum leaders will then share data with their respective departments. As a result, data will be utilized to drive instructional decisions during common planning meetings.

Person Responsible   Jorge Bulnes (pr7741@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17 - During common planning sessions, departments will meet to dissect relevant test specifications in preparation for the administration of 2022 spring assessments. Departments will identify item boundaries and plan for strategic instruction.

Person Responsible   Jose Gonzalez (jmgonzalez@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17 - Curriculum leaders, including departmental chairpersons and coaches, will disseminate ICAD information to staff personnel focusing on curriculum district requirements and initiatives.

Person Responsible   Janelle Bravo-San Pedro (jbravosanpedro@dadeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the 2021 School Climate Survey taken by our students, there is a positive trend in how students feel about their school climate. A significant number of students (17.5 percent) responded that they enjoy coming to their school. Additionally, a 7.13 percent positive increase was evident when students were asked if teachers are interested in how they do in the future. Our goal is to celebrate both academic and social successes this year to help maintain the students' positive opinions of our school.
Measurable Outcome:	To celebrate faculty success, we will highlight successes each month at our faculty meeting. Student successes will be showcased once each week on our morning announcements. Highlighting students who made academic strides and positive actions in our school community will be a focus this year.
Monitoring:	The administrative team will accept suggestions from the faculty and students for the faculty members to be highlighted during faculty meetings. Additionally, faculty will nominate students to be highlighted each week.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Janelle Bravo-San Pedro (jbravosanpedro@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy chosen is Celebrate Successes. Celebrate Successes is when staff and student accomplishments are given special recognition and achievements are publicly celebrated allowing for encouragement from all stakeholders.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the 2021 School Climate Survey taken by our students, there is a positive trend in how students feel about their school climate. A significant number of students (17.5 percent) responded that they enjoy coming to their school. Additionally, a 7.13 percent positive increase was evident when students were asked if teachers are interested in how they do in the future. Our goal is to celebrate both academic and social successes this year to help maintain the students' positive opinions of our school.

Action Steps to Implement

8/17 - Create faculty meeting schedule for the year and incorporate a standing item to celebrate faculty successes. As a result, faculty and staff will feel celebrated and appreciated, creating a more positive work environment.

Person Responsible Janelle Bravo-San Pedro (jbravosanpedro@dadeschools.net)

8/17 - 10/28- Establish and utilize a streamline system for staff members and students to communicate faculty successes in and out of the classroom. As a result, faculty and staff will be able to share their successes involving clubs, sports teams, classes, student groups, etc. easily with the school administrative team.

Person Responsible Janelle Bravo-San Pedro (jbravosanpedro@dadeschools.net)

8/18 - 10/28 - Share successes at faculty meetings and on all social media platforms. As a result, positive information about our school will become public knowledge on social media, increasing the positive image of our school.

Person Responsible Janelle Bravo-San Pedro (jbravosanpedro@dadeschools.net)

8/18-10/28 - Faculty will nominte students to be highlighted for positive behavior. As a result, students will be recognized for positive behavior, increasing the student morale and positive image of our school.

Person Responsible Janelle Bravo-San Pedro (jbravosanpedro@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17 - Southwest Miami Senior High School's goal to maintain/improve student interest in school is ongoing. As a result, several events will be held in November and December that will promote student talent and community. Some examples include the 2021 Dance Show and the 2021 Pine Cove Holiday Show.

Person Responsible Jorge Bulnes (pr7741@dadeschools.net)

12/15 - Faculty and staff will be invited to a holiday luncheon that will provide staff with an environment that will boost morale by promoting congeniality and holiday spirit. Post-pandemic social interaction is important in the building of a strong school community.

Person Responsible Jorge Bulnes (pr7741@dadeschools.net)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2019: The 9th grade ELA data show that we are nine percent below the district average and nine percent below the state average.
	The 10th grade ELA data show that we are six percent below the district average and six percent below the state average.
	The Algebra 1 EOC data show that we are 28 percent below the district average and 26 percent below the state average.
	The Biology EOC data show that we are 11 percent below the district average and ten percent below the state average.
	The US History EOC data show that we are five percent below the district average and four percent below the state average.
	Our ELL subgroup data show 29 percent overall achievement, 44 percent overall learning gains, and 40 percent learning gains in the lowest 25 percent population on the 2019 ELA FSA. Similarly, the data show 36 percent overall achievement, 43 percent overall learning gains, and 39 percent learning gains in the lowest 25 percent population on the 2019 Math FSA EOC. ELL students performed similarly on the U.S. History and Biology EOCs, with 47 percent achievement in Biology and 48 percent achievement in U.S. History.
	One trend that is evident is that SWD and ELL students score similarly in Math, Science, and Social Studies; however, the difference in scores on the FSA ELA is significant with ELL students making higher learning gains than SWD.
Measurable Outcome:	As a school, we expect overall student achievement to increase as a result of the implementation of these practices. This will be evident in local and state assessment data.
Monitoring:	The administrative team will disseminate data to all Curriculum Leaders who will, in turn, share the data with the teachers in their departments. Each teacher will be responsible for data chats with their students. Additionally, data will be displayed schoolwide to promote ownership and celebrate success.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy chosen is Taking Ownership for Students' Learning. Taking Ownership for Students' Learning involves school leaders continuously taking accountability for student progress and outcomes. Leaders revisit progress towards outcomes and determine action steps to ensure students are supported and able to meet the goals set forth for or by them. Leaders reflect on their own practices and progress and determine necessary self-improvement to ensure students are successful.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on our assessment data from 2019 and our mid-year data from the 2020-21 school year, there is a need for schoolwide progress monitoring and student ownership of their own learning and achievement.
Action Steps to Implement	

8/23 - 10/28 - The administrative team will meet with Curriculum Leaders monthly to assure that all data is shared. Additionally, schoolwide data will be posted throughout the school campus. As a result, students will take ownership of their own data, increasing accountability and student achievement.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

8/23 - 10/28 - Curriculum Leaders will share data with the members of their departments. As a result, data will be utilized during common planning to drive instructional devisions.

Person Responsible Janelle Bravo-San Pedro (jbravosanpedro@dadeschools.net)

8/23 - 10/28 - Teachers will conduct monthly data chats with all students to assure that students take ownership of their learning and progress. As a result, there will be an increase in the accountability for each student of his/her own data, increasing student involvement and achievement.

Person Responsible Janelle Bravo-San Pedro (jbravosanpedro@dadeschools.net)

8/23 - 10/28 - Each department/subject area/grade level will create a data chat form to utilize during student data chats. The forms created will be specific to each department/subject area/grade level. As a result, student accountability of their own data will increase, increasin g accountability and achievement.

Person Responsible Janelle Bravo-San Pedro (jbravosanpedro@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17 - Administration will meet with curriculum leaders, including departmental chairpersons and coaches to review/analyze the 2021 baseline assessment data. Information with departments will be disseminated through data chats.

Person Responsible Jose Gonzalez (jmgonzalez@dadeschools.net)

11/22-12/17 - District mid-year assessments will be administered by teachers, as a means of monitoring student progression/achievement. Performance Matters will be utilized by curriculum leaders, including departmental chairpersons and coaches. Results of the mid-year assessments will be used to drive instruction.

Person Responsible Ana Roll (anamroll@dadeschools.net)

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.

Based on the data presented in PowerBI, our student attendance increased significantly in the 2020-21 school year. 46 percent of our students had zero to five absences for the school year, 20 percent had six to ten absences, and only 34 percent had more than ten absences. Additionally, only one disciplinary referral was written last year. This is significantly lower when compared to the district and state referral percentages. School culture and environment, including whether or not students feel safe while at school and they have a desire to come to school, will be monitored through attendance and disciplinary data.

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.

We maintain a pattern of supportive interactions which foster positive staff-student relationships through the establishing a positive tone of interactions, establishing and maintaining high expectations, creating an inclusive environment, and opening lines of communication with all stakeholders.

We also create positive social support for students through supportive peer relationships and encourage mutual respect for individual differences and promote tolerance and inclusivity through our PIT Crew (Peers as Partners in Learning) and our inclusive school community.

We enforce protocols which ensure safe and hazard free physical surrounding by strategically placing security throughout the building and practicing security measures such as keeping classroom doors locked and having teachers stand at their doors to welcome students and monitor hall traffic.

We connect student's life goals to educational opportunities by offering a diverse selection of extracurricular activities and academic programs such as the STEM Education Program, .NET Academy and Academy of Banking and Finance.

We maintain clean, orderly and appealing physical surrounding through regular maintenance and daily cleaning of school building and grounds.

We also encourage family and community participation and engagement with the school by through activities such as social media, senior night, Advance Academics parent meetings, PTA, EESAC, and booster clubs.

We have established protocols that encourage a welcoming classroom environment by sharing ideas on how to create a positive classroom space.

We also enforce school policies in an equitable manner through our progressive discipline plan and hold all students accountable.

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

The principal sets a positive, supportive tone for all members of the school community. The administrative team works hand-in-hand with curriculum leaders to disseminate goals and expectations to the faculty and

staff. This allows for an open line of communication and clear expectations throughout the school. All stakeholders work to assure a safe and secure school environment.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**