

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Alonzo & Tracy Mournig Senior High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 22 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 31 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 31 |

Alonzo & Tracy Mourning Senior High School

2601 NE 151ST ST, Miami, FL 33160

<http://atmourning.dadeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Shinn J

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2016

| | |
|--|--|
| 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) | 69% |
| 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (59%) |
| 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 22 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 31 |

Alonzo & Tracy Mourning Senior High School

2601 NE 151ST ST, Miami, FL 33160

<http://atmourning.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 | No | 68% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 75% |

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.

The mission of Alonzo and Tracy Mournig Senior High is to support student learning through the cooperation, devotion, and determination of all stakeholders, including parents, students, teachers, administrators, support personnel, and the communities in which our students live. We intend to provide our students with the best academic choices and diverse educational opportunities. We will strive to establish an environment that fosters high standards and expectations, challenges all students to reach their fullest potential, and empowers them to become productive, successful, and socially conscious members of our ever changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Alonzo and Tracy Mournig Senior High is to provide the highest quality of education through small learning communities and challenge our students to achieve and demonstrate academic excellence by acquiring the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in a competitive, ever changing global society.

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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Shinn, Christopher | Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Managing the physical, financial, and human resources of the school. -Building an effective school-community partnership. - Understanding the interpretation and application of data to drive school improvement. - Providing instructional leadership to increase the quality of teaching and learning at the school site. -Providing vision and leadership to foster a culture of high expectations for all students. -Ensuring the safety of students and staff. |
| Medina, Eddie | Assistant Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Safety and security -Maintenance of building and facilities -Athletics -Social emotional learning initiatives -Exceptional Student Education -Science -Industry Certification -IPEGS -11th and 12th Grade Discipline -Attendance -Uniform Policy |
| Trillas, Lucy | Assistant Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -School Improvement Process -Master Schedule -Student Services -Progress Monitoring -Graduation Rate and Tracker -Mathematics -English Language Arts -Reading -Professional Learning Support Team |
| Diallo, Molly | Teacher, K-12 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -MINT Coordinator -Advanced Placement teacher -Social Studies Chair -President of the Social Emotional Learning Committee |
| Berkson, Lisa | Instructional Coach | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Test Chair -Data Specialist -Student Services Chair |
| Lambert, Victor | Teacher, K-12 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Digital Innovator -Math Chair Advanced Placement Teacher |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Baldizon, Steven | Teacher, K-12 | -Activities Director -PD Liaison |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/1/2016, Christopher Shinn J

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.*

21

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.*

37

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

49

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,552

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

3

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

6

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 | 425 | 377 | 362 | 388 | 1552 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 63 | 77 | 79 | 312 |
| 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 | 26 | 18 | 26 | 63 | 133 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 58 | 66 | 49 | 200 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 49 | 68 | 81 | 243 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 60 | 54 | 87 | 247 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 211 |

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 | 62 | 77 | 78 | 110 | 327 |

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 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 9 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/16/2021

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 | 387 | 390 | 415 | 406 | 1598 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 77 | 78 | 92 | 312 | |
| 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 | 19 | 24 | 63 | 1 | 107 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 65 | 49 | 3 | 175 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 69 | 83 | 79 | 276 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 55 | 90 | 89 | 291 | |

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 | 76 | 78 | 109 | 77 | 340 |

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 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 14 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 10 | |

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 | | | | 63% | 59% | 56% | 60% | 59% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 57% | 54% | 51% | 54% | 56% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 45% | 48% | 42% | 45% | 51% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 55% | 54% | 51% | 61% | 51% | 51% |

| School Grade Component | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 51% | 52% | 48% | 55% | 50% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 40% | 51% | 45% | 42% | 51% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 66% | 68% | 68% | 64% | 65% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 74% | 76% | 73% | 72% | 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 | 60% | 55% | 5% | 55% | 5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 56% | 53% | 3% | 53% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -60% | | | | |

| 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 | 62% | 68% | -6% | 67% | -5% |
| 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 | | | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 72% | 71% | 1% | 70% | 2% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 51% | 63% | -12% | 61% | -10% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 55% | 54% | 1% | 57% | -2% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

District mid-year assessment results were used to compile the data below.

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | 59% | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 52% | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 27% | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | 70% | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 69% | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 61% | |
| | English Language Learners | | 48% | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | | | | |

| Grade 10 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | 59% | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 57% | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 3% | |
| | English Language Learners | | 53% | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | 42% | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 41% | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 24% | |
| | English Language Learners | | 25% | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | 10% | |
| Biology | Economically Disadvantaged | | 8% | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 3% | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| US History | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |

| Grade 11 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------------------------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | 68% 65% 21% 59% | |

| Grade 12 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students 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 | 32 | 39 | 32 | 40 | 46 | 43 | 50 | 46 | | 84 | 27 |
| ELL | 19 | 40 | 42 | 29 | 36 | 35 | 32 | 52 | | 92 | 61 |
| ASN | 45 | 40 | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | 37 | 39 | 29 | 32 | 30 | 55 | 64 | | 100 | 42 |
| HSP | 48 | 46 | 41 | 35 | 35 | 34 | 53 | 60 | | 93 | 65 |

| 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 |
| WHT | 66 | 56 | 57 | 50 | 31 | | 56 | 81 | | 95 | 62 |
| FRL | 47 | 45 | 41 | 32 | 32 | 34 | 53 | 62 | | 95 | 58 |
| 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 | 35 | 43 | 36 | 29 | 33 | 17 | 67 | 55 | | 93 | 46 |
| ELL | 37 | 50 | 42 | 43 | 50 | 47 | 46 | 56 | | 86 | 54 |
| ASN | 67 | 70 | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 51 | 54 | 40 | 42 | 39 | 40 | 55 | 68 | | 97 | 64 |
| HSP | 61 | 55 | 48 | 54 | 51 | 42 | 66 | 73 | | 92 | 72 |
| WHT | 74 | 61 | 37 | 71 | 56 | 27 | 74 | 83 | | 90 | 77 |
| FRL | 56 | 54 | 41 | 49 | 48 | 39 | 62 | 71 | | 91 | 68 |
| 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 | 47 | 53 | 30 | 32 | 38 | 23 | 41 | 52 | | 95 | 11 |
| ELL | 29 | 47 | 46 | 53 | 51 | 50 | 53 | 53 | | 84 | 53 |
| BLK | 49 | 54 | 45 | 44 | 49 | 43 | 44 | 69 | | 87 | 32 |
| HSP | 59 | 51 | 43 | 59 | 55 | 42 | 67 | 68 | | 91 | 60 |
| WHT | 69 | 58 | 50 | 78 | 59 | 38 | 73 | 80 | | 96 | 68 |
| FRL | 56 | 53 | 45 | 56 | 53 | 43 | 60 | 68 | | 90 | 51 |

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 | 53 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 58 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 580 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 94% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 44 |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 45 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 43 |
| 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 | 47 |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 61 |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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 Data Findings:

According to 2019 performance data, all ELA Subgroups increased in proficiency and learning gains with the exception of SWD which decreased by 8 and 10 percentage points respectively. ELA Subgroups Learning Gains for the L25, however, decreased in achievement with the exception of SWD which increased by 6 percentage points. Math Subgroups additionally decreased in proficiency, learning gains, and learning gains for the L25. Science Subgroups, with the exception of ELLs which dropped six percentage points, either increased in proficiency or stayed the same. Social Studies Subgroups, furthermore, increased in proficiency with the exceptions of the Black subgroup which dropped by 1 percentage point. Of equal importance, all College and Career Acceleration Subgroups increased in participation.

2021 Data Findings:

Approximately 35% of the 1718 cohort has exhibited two or more early warning indicators for the last two years. The cohort additionally boasts the most level ones on both the FSA ELA and the Algebra 1 EOC across grade levels. Forty-eight-percent of Cohort 2122 demonstrates a reading deficiency compared to Cohort 2021's 13%.

Math, furthermore, has witnessed more course failures over the last two years than has English Language Arts, with the former averaging approximately 68 more course failures.

Additionally, 2021 summative data illustrates that our school decreased in ten of the eleven accountable areas. Math proficiency and Math Learning Gains, specifically, saw a decrease of 17 percentage points.

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

2019 Data Findings:

While most Subgroups witnessed an increase in performance data across accountable areas, Math witnessed a decrease in all three accountable categories: proficiency, learning gains, and learning gains for the L25. In ELA, the SWD subgroup also demonstrated an 8 and 10 percentage point decrease in proficiency and learning gains respectively.

2021 Data Findings:

2021 state assessment scores illustrate a drop in proficiency across accountable areas. The greatest drop in achievement, however, was demonstrated not in the L25 subgroup but in proficiency and learning gain data overall. In ELA, for example, 2021 data reflects an 11 percentage point decrease with learning gain data also demonstrating a 9 percentage point drop. In Math, proficiency ratings dropped 17 percentage points with learning gain data also reflecting a 17 percentage point decrease.

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 Data Findings:

Although the Algebra 1 and Geometry teams meet regularly to analyze emergent data and plan for remediation/enrichment, the teams do not have common planning time during the school day. The Geometry team, specifically, does not have the extra instructional time that its Algebra 1 counterpart has with the extra period of remediation each standard student is scheduled to have. Ideally, both teams would have built in common planning time and platooned sections for all standard Algebra and Geometry courses.

The SWD subgroup experienced a drop in ELA proficiency and learning gains arguably because the ESE department was not fully staffed throughout the 2018-2019 school year. To correct this issue, the ESE department will seek to hire content experts in ELA to serve as Support Facilitators.

2021 Data Findings:

Due to the drop in proficiency and learning gain data evinced in Geometry over the course of the last three years, this year we scheduled all standard Geometry students for platooned sections of Geometry. Given the extra instructional time, the Geometry team will work together to plan for remediation opportunities and small group instruction.

In addition to implementing tiered interventions in our English Language Arts classrooms to counteract the drop in ELA proficiency ratings and learning gains evinced in 2021 performance data, the school will use its newly assigned literacy coach to support the implementation of the Read 180 program in Intensive Reading classrooms and to facilitate progress monitoring initiatives across literacy classrooms.

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

2019 Data Findings:

With the exception of the SWD subgroup in ELA, Social Studies, and Science Subgroups experienced an increase in performance.

2021 Data Findings:

Despite experiencing a 6 percentage drop in Math proficiency in 2019 and a 17 percentage point drop in 2021, the 2021 Algebra 1 cohort performed only 1 percentage below the state in terms of proficiency.

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

2019 Data Findings:

The integration of technology as a tool for remediation, progress monitoring, engagement, and enrichment led to an increase in performance in ELA, Social Studies, and Science.

2021 Data Findings:

Although no new actions were taken in this area to engender the results evinced on the 2021 Algebra 1 EOC, the collaborative planning, data-driven decision making, and standards-aligned instructional efforts of the Algebra 1 team arguably contributed to this noteworthy data point.

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

To accelerate learning, the school will engage in standards-aligned instruction, monitor student progress via progress monitoring tools, provide tiered interventions both during and beyond the classroom, participate in collaborative planning, and continue to incorporate technology for remediation, engagement, and enrichment.

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.

To accelerate learning, the Professional Learning Support Team, in conjunction with Miami Learns and the school's literacy coach, will work to facilitate professional development opportunities on knowledge of learners, data-driven decision making, tiered interventions, and technology use for remediation, engagement, and enrichment.

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

In addition to tiered interventions in the classroom, the school will seek to provide push-in interventions as well as beyond the bell tutoring opportunities. The school's Professional Learning Support Team will also provide strategic professional development opportunities, on-site, after school and on weekends.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on the number of students identified as having a substantial reading deficiency in 9th and 10th grade and the number of students in need of achieving the reading and math graduation flag in 11th and 12th grade, small group instruction will have to take place across all accountable areas but especially in English Language Arts and Mathematics. 2020-2021 performance data, which saw a drop in ten of the eleven accountable areas, further illustrates the need for small-group intervention to mitigate learning loss and provide remediation opportunities across accountable areas to ensure that proficiency ratings and learning gains increase once again.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the first nine weeks, Intensive Reading and Developmental classes will provide small group instruction, for at least 20 minutes, every other class.

Monitoring: The administrative team will monitor instructional routines and lesson plans to ensure that small group instruction is taking place with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Shinn (cshinn@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

To engender the desired outcome, the Reading Department will adopt the Read 180 program and practice the Gradual Release Model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The Reading Department will be receiving professional development and support in implementing the newly revised Read 180 curriculum this year. This program calls for small-group instruction as one of its three rotations. Invoking the Gradual Release Model will also allow teachers the opportunity to provide small-group instruction during the release portion of class.

Action Steps to Implement

By October 11th, the Reading Department will attend Read 180 professional development offerings. As a result, IR teachers will have a better understanding of the three rotations at the core of the Read 180 program and how to facilitate them.

Person Responsible Ellen Clark (emclark@dadeschools.net)

By October 11th, the literacy coach will have modeled small group instruction for all Intensive Reading and Developmental Language Arts teachers. As a result, literacy teachers will be able to plan for and execute small group instruction regularly.

Person Responsible Lucy Trillas (ltrillas@dadeschools.net)

On September 21st, the first department meeting of the school year, the literacy coach will share instructional materials for use during small-group instruction. As a result, literacy teachers will have instructional resources to support small-group instruction.

Person Responsible Lucy Trillas (ltrillas@dadeschools.net)

By October 5th, the literacy coach will have presented best practices for small-group instruction across content areas. As a result, content areas outside of ELA will be able to implement small-group instruction.

Person Responsible Christopher Shinn (cshinn@dadeschools.net)

By November 16th, the assistant principal over literacy and mathematics, the literacy coach, the PLST's Instructional Coach, and the Math Department Chair will have developed an instructional focus calendar and identified a targeted student group for pull-out intervention.

Person Responsible Lucy Trillas (ltrillas@dadeschools.net)

By December 17th, Algebra 1, Geometry, and 9th and 10th grade ELA teachers will have analyzed mid-year assessment data and planned for upcoming remediation opportunities through small-group instruction.

Person Responsible Christopher Shinn (cshinn@dadeschools.net)

By February 4th, the administrator over literacy and mathematics and the literacy coach will have monitored small group interventions efforts in both intensive reading and math for retake students.

Person Responsible Christopher Shinn (cshinn@dadeschools.net)

By April 29th, the administrator over literacy and mathematics, the Math Department Chair, and the literacy coach will have refined and monitored small group intervention efforts for ELA 10th grade bubble students and 9th grade level 1 and 2 Algebra 1.

Person Responsible Christopher Shinn (cshinn@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

To meet the needs evinced by the drop in proficiency ratings across ten out of the eleven accountable areas, the school will need to engage in professional learning opportunities centered on knowledge of learners, using data to guide decision making and instruction, implementing technology tools for remediation and engagement, and standards-aligned instruction. By participating in professional learning opportunities focused on small group instruction, specifically, faculty will be to turnkey interventions on a regular basis and work to mitigate the learning loss evinced across accountable areas on 2020-2021 FSA and EOC data.

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the first semester, every teacher will have participated in at least one professional development opportunity offered by Miami Learns or the Professional Development Support Team.

Monitoring:

The Professional Learning Support Team, along with Miami Learns, will promote and facilitate professional learning opportunities on campus. The PLST will provide the administrative team with PD rosters so that the administrative team can encourage participation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Shinn (cshinn@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The Professional Learning Support Team will facilitate peer observations by implementing Pineapple Charts schoolwide and supporting Teacher-Driven Observation efforts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

According to the SIP 2122 Dashboard, only 45% of teachers surveyed maintain they receive support from teacher leaders on a regular basis. Upon reviewing this data point, the PLST believed that facilitating peer observations would help provide teachers with the ongoing support they want.

Action Steps to Implement

By September 21st, the PLST will have surveyed staff on professional development needs/wants via a Microsoft Form. As a result, the PLST will be able to conceptualize relevant development opportunities.

Person Responsible

Victor Lambert (vlambert@dadeschools.net)

By October 11th, the PLST will have facilitated peer observation requests made on the schoolwide Pineapple Chart. As a result, teachers will be able to observe an exemplary lesson to potentially turnkey in their own classroom.

Person Responsible

Lisa Berkson (lberkson@dadeschools.net)

By October 5th, the PLST and MINT Mentors will have met with new teachers to discuss new teacher development opportunities. As a result, MINT mentors and mentees will have a calendar for upcoming meeting dates and support sessions.

Person Responsible

Molly Diallo (mdiallo@dadeschools.net)

By October 11th, each member of the Professional Learning Support Team will have proposed or facilitated a professional learning opportunity onsite. As a result, teachers will have received relevant and strategic development to help them achieve their Deliberate Practice Growth Target (DPGT).

Person Responsible Lucy Trillas (ltrillas@dadeschools.net)

By December 21st, the Professional Learning Support Team's Instructional Coach will have facilitated a professional development opportunity on data-driven decision making. After participating in this professional development, teachers will be able to use Performance Matters reports to build intervention groups and to provide remediation on targeted standards.

Person Responsible Lisa Berkson (lberkson@dadeschools.net)

By December 21st, the Professional Learning Support Team's MINT Coordinator will have facilitated at least one learning walk for new teachers. As a result of this professional learning opportunity, new teachers will be able to implement new instructional strategies or techniques observed during the learning walks.

Person Responsible Molly Diallo (mdiallo@dadeschools.net)

By April 29th, the PLST will have proposed and facilitated another professional development opportunity through the Miami Learns Initiative.

Person Responsible Lucy Trillas (ltrillas@dadeschools.net)

By February 24th, the ELA Curriculum Support Specialist and the literacy coach will have facilitated a professional development opportunity for ELA teachers on the new standards and instructional materials.

Person Responsible Lucy Trillas (ltrillas@dadeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

There are several factors that necessitate this area of focus. For one, 2021 Advanced Placement participation data indicates that fewer minority students achieved a passing score on advance placement exam last year than did their White peers. Furthermore, only ten percent of Black students at our participated in an advanced placements course last year, while 22 and 23 percent of their White and Hispanic peers, respectively, participated in AP. Additionally, anecdotal data gathered by a newly created Equity and Diversity committee also echo the need to promote initiative centered on increasing equity and diversity.

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the first nine weeks of the 2021-2022 school year, the Equity and Diversity Committee will have met to develop a school-based Equity and Diversity Survey and to analyze survey findings.

Monitoring:

The administrative team, alongside the instructional staff serving on the Diversity and Equity Committee, will participate in monthly meetings and work to ensure that the team's initiatives are developed and implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Shinn (cshinn@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The Equity and Diversity Committee will adopt Social Emotional Learning (SEL) as its evidence-based strategy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Two years ago, the school implemented an SEL Committee. The committee spearheaded several initiatives that resulted in positive stakeholder feedback and equitable participation/ investment amongst student groups. This year, the Equity and Diversity Committee will rely on SEL to accomplish its goals once again.

Action Steps to Implement

By September 30th, the committee will have met to conceptualize an Equity and Diversity Survey for students and staff. As a result of the survey, the committee will be able to diagnose areas of School Culture in need of improvement.

Person Responsible

Eddie Medina (emedina@dadeschools.net)

By October 5th, the committee will have shared the survey with staff at a faculty meeting and facilitated its distribution during homeroom throughout the week of October 11th-15th. As a result, instructional staff will understand the purpose of the survey and its findings.

Person Responsible

Eddie Medina (emedina@dadeschools.net)

By October 11th, members of the committee will meet to analyze survey findings and to develop a year-long calendar. As a result, the committee will be able to develop initiatives grounded on student and staff feedback.

Person Responsible

Eddie Medina (emedina@dadeschools.net)

By October 11th, the committee will share survey findings with Curriculum Council and solicit council input on findings and proposed SEL calendar.

Person Responsible Christopher Shinn (cshinn@dadeschools.net)

By December 21st, the administrative team, alongside the instructional staff serving on the Diversity and Equity Committee, will have participated in at least one additional monthly meeting to review the proposed SEL Calendar. This action step will lead to greater stakeholder buy-in before the calendar implementation.

Person Responsible Eddie Medina (emedina@dadeschools.net)

By December 21st, the Diversity and Equity Committee will have facilitated the first SEL activity schoolwide. Implementation of this action step will lead to the promotion of the committee's shared vision and mission of promoting an equitable and inclusive school.

Person Responsible Molly Diallo (mdiallo@dadeschools.net)

By February 28th, the Diversity and Equity Committee will have vetted and finalized the equity survey and prepared a timeline for its distribution.

Person Responsible Eddie Medina (emedina@dadeschools.net)

By April 29th, the Diversity and Equity Committee will have met to analyze survey findings and to plan for the committee's next steps.

Person Responsible Eddie Medina (emedina@dadeschools.net)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | According to SIP 2122 survey findings, only 45% of instructional staff maintains it receives instructional support from an instructional leader on a regular basis. Furthermore, only 27% of instructional staff reported receiving guidance on making data-driven decisions on a weekly or monthly basis. |
| Measurable Outcome: | SIP Survey results for 2021-2022 will reflect that the 23% of instructional staff who did not receive support during the 2020-2021 school year received support from an instructional leader on a monthly basis, at minimum, during the 2021-2022 school year. |
| Monitoring: | The Area of Focus will be monitored by way of department meeting minutes, professional development agendas, and instructional coach logs/feedback. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Christopher Shinn (cshinn@dadeschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | To achieve the desired outcome, we will implement the Make Meetings Matter evidenced-based strategy. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Given the learning loss evinced by way of 2021 state assessment results, teachers will need the opportunity to lean on one another as a resource to work strategically and effectively. Because our master schedule does not allow for common planning time, the school must find ways to provide these opportunities outside of the school day, specifically during faculty and department meetings, to ensure that meeting time is used for problem solving and reviewing progress. |

Action Steps to Implement

By September 21st, department chairs will have surveyed teachers interested in collaborating after school, bi-weekly, and shared those findings with administration. As a result, the principal will be able to review the school budget and provide hourly compensation accordingly.

Person Responsible Christopher Shinn (cshinn@dadeschools.net)

By October 5th, instructional staff will have participated in one department meeting and faculty meeting that facilitated the sharing of best practices. As a result, meeting time will be more purposeful and teachers will receive resources/strategies to turnkey in their own classrooms.

Person Responsible Christopher Shinn (cshinn@dadeschools.net)

By October 11th, teacher leaders and participants who signed up to model/observe an exemplary lesson during the first quarter on the schoolwide Pineapple Chart, will have met and debriefed following the observed lesson. As a result, both the teacher leader and the observer will have amassed new resources/strategies to turnkey in their own classrooms.

Person Responsible Lisa Berkson (lberkson@dadeschools.net)

By October 1st, the PLST and the literacy coach will have collaborated with Miami Learns to develop a schoolwide professional development calendar for the 2021-2022 school year. As a result, teachers will be able to choose from an array of courses, onsite, to help them achieve their Deliberate Practice Growth Target (DPGT).

Person Responsible Lucy Trillas (ltrillas@dadeschools.net)

By December 21st, teacher leaders and participants who signed up to model/observe an exemplary lesson during the second quarter on the schoolwide Pineapple Chart, will have met and debriefed following the observed lesson. As a result, both the teacher leader and the observer will have amassed new resources/strategies to turnkey in their own classrooms.

Person Responsible Lisa Berkson (lberkson@dadeschools.net)

By December 21st, the literacy coach will have surveyed teachers and provided support to any teacher, regardless of content area, wishing to learn more about small group instruction and/or literacy strategies. As a result of this action step, non-literacy teachers will be able to provide strategic remediation/ incorporate literacy strategies within their classrooms.

Person Responsible Lucy Trillas (ltrillas@dadeschools.net)

By April 29th, the PLST and MINT Mentors will have facilitated 2nd semester learning walks for their assigned mentees.

Person Responsible Molly Diallo (mdiallo@dadeschools.net)

By April 29th, the principal will have sent out a survey to ascertain the number of aspiring teachers at the school site. Based on the findings, the administrative will then develop an action plan to facilitate leadership opportunities for interested teachers.

Person Responsible Christopher Shinn (cshinn@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

According to SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, Alonzo and Tracy Mournig Senior High reported 2.5 incidents per 100 students in the 2019-2020 school year. More specifically, the school ranked 56 out of 74 senior high schools in the county for its violent incidents; 49 out of 74 for its number of property incidents; and 55 out of 74 for its drug/public order incidents. Although the school ranks below the state's rate of incidents reported, Alonzo and Tracy Mournig will seek to monitor its number of drug-related incidents.

To monitor behavior and promote a welcoming and safe school culture, the school will implement positive behavior initiatives, uphold the tenets of progressive discipline, and provide counseling in lieu of suspension or disciplinary referrals. The school will additionally seek to monitor its discipline data by way of PowerBI and principal reports.

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.

In addition to upholding a supportive and inclusive environment in the classroom, the school currently boasts two committees, The Diversity and Equity Committee and the SEL Committee, whose primary focus is to increase social-emotional development as well as to promote diversity and equity. Both committees meet monthly to discuss areas of need and potential growth and to develop schoolwide initiatives for teachers to turnkey during homeroom.

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

Although the administrative team, instructional staff, Students Services team, support personnel, and student leaders all work together to engender a positive school culture and environment, the school relies greatly on additional stakeholder groups to engender the optimal learning environment. The school, for instance, relies heavily on its PTSA, EESAC members, and community partners, such as Florida International University, to secure student incentives, volunteers, and even acceleration opportunities for its students. It additionally receives support from its Region Superintendent and North Region Administrative Staff as well as its School Board Member, Lucia Baez-Geller. It boasts a mentorship program sponsored by HoneyShine.org and Ms. Tracy Wilson Mourningofte and often works in tandem with The City of North Miami Police Department to monitor school safety initiatives. Recently, the school has begun to call on its alumni for mentorship and sponsorships.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |