Iprep Academy North

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Iprep Academy North

1420 NE 215TH ST, Miami, FL 33179

northregion.dadeschoools.net

Demographics

Principal: Francisco Garnica E

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	46%
2021-22 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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (78%) 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade
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	N/A
* 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

Iprep Academy North

1420 NE 215TH ST, Miami, FL 33179

northregion.dadeschoools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	No	46%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

School Grades History

Year	**2021-22**	**2020-21**
Grade	A	

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.

Our mission is to create a unique, collaborative environment that cultivates strong academic skills, knowledge, and the talents of STEM students and promotes life skills to increase student opportunities beyond graduation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to challenge, nurture, and empower students' creativity with a global, rigorous, technology-enhanced college-preparatory curriculum.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Garnica, Francisco	Principal	Oversees the daily activities and operations within the school.
Baptiste, Marieyola	Assistant Principal	Assists in overseeing the daily activities and operations within the school.
Gbadebo, Samuel	Other	Provides support to students and teachers in implementing the Cambridge curriculum, manages school activities, manages the gradebook, and coordinates testing activities.
Treto, Lorena	School Counselor	Provides social and emotional support services to students.
Guzman, Wendy	Teacher, K-12	Leads teachers in collaboration based on student data and teacher identified areas of growth.
Collazo, Annette	Other	Supports teaching and learning as Professional Development Liaison.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/14/2022, Francisco Garnica E

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

23

Total number of students enrolled at the school

483

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

3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	123	99	61	75	31	0	483
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	3	2	2	0	13
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	3	2	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	5	8	8	0	39
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	3	6	2	0	23
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	3	6	4	0	26
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	16	6	10	2	0	48

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	7	7	4	7	5	0	30

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/7/2022

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	127	102	74	79	32	0	0	414
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	3	1	0	0	14
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	0	3	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	7	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	3	2	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	2	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	19	15	21	0	0	0	63

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	2	5	2	3	0	0	12

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	123	89	64	74	35	0	0	385
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	2	2	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	10	2	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	8	10	9	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	3	2	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	2	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	19	15	21	0	0	0	63

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	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	82%	54%	51%					59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	66%							54%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%							48%	42%
Math Achievement	81%	42%	38%					54%	51%
Math Learning Gains	74%							52%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%							51%	45%
Science Achievement	86%	41%	40%					68%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	96%	56%	48%					76%	73%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	50	50									
ELL	57	54	58	65	72	64	84	85	70		
BLK	85	66	72	80	61	69	87	100	79		
HSP	80	69	58	77	76	71	86	93	81		
WHT	84	61	70	85	75	69	85	97	87		
FRL	79	63	66	75	68	69	84	94	77		
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
ELL	57	48	50	34	12	11	54	69	35		
BLK	65	62		46	21						
HSP	69	50	39	50	20	10	63	77	55		
WHT	79	58	45	67	24	33	60	85	55		
FRL	70	56	43	41	18	18	58	71	40		
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	703
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	68
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	78
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	77
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	79
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	75
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

The 2022 data indicates the following trend: average scores in FSA ELA and FSA/EOC Math in the 80s.
The 2022 ELA proficiency across all grade levels was 82%.
In FSA 6th grade Math, and EOC Algebra I and EOC Geometry proficiency across all grade levels was 81%. Proficiency in FSA 6th grade Math was 88%, in Algebra I it was 80%, and in Geometry it was 72%

Another 2022 data trend: the highest performing grade was 6th grade:
Across grade levels in ELA, the 6th graders outperformed the other grade levels with 86% proficiency, then 8th grade (84%), 9th grade (83%), 7th grade (82%), and then 10th (66%).
Across grade levels in Math, the 6th graders outperformed the other grade levels with 88% proficiency, then 7th grade Algebra I (80%), 8th grade Geometry (72%).

Another 2022 data trend indicates higher learning gains in the Maths, for both the total population of students and the lowest performing quartile:
With regard to learning gains, ELA learning gains (66%) were lower than Math learning gains (74%).
With regard to learning gains among the lowest performing quartile, ELA learning gains among the lowest performing quartile (64%) were lower than overall Math learning gains for lowest performing quartile (71%).

An emerging trend among the subgroups, with the ESE/SWD subgroup outperforming the ELL subgroup:
In ELA, the proficiency data is as follows: ESE/SWD 45%, and ELL 10%.
In Maths, the proficiency data is as follows: Math: ESE/SWD 67%, and ELL 0%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The FSA/EOC show that the ELA core content area, particularly in the 10th grade group; Geometry; and ESE and ELL subgroups are in greatest need of improvement.

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

Some of the identified contributing factors for ELA deficiencies include: instructional inconsistency/ interruptions due to staffing changes and in-person instruction availability, and student work load from Math courses.

Some of the identified contributing factors for Geometry deficiencies include increasingly rigorous

coursework without needed supports.

Some of the identified contributing factors for ESE and ELL deficiencies include: lack of instructional support for these students, such as lack of differentiated instruction, a need for cross-department collaboration on best practices to address ESE/ELL needs in class and during testing, and a need for early identification of struggling students needing interventions followed by an action plan.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

FSA and EOC Math proficiency and learning gains showed the most improvement. Math proficiency increased from 55% 2021 to 81% in 2022. In Math, learning gains for all students increased from 22% to 74% and learning gains for the lowest performing quartile increased from 16% to 71%.

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

The key contributing factor was a return to in-person instruction and an expanded after school tutoring program.

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

Differentiated Instruction, Instructional Support and Coaching, Creating Mentorship and Partnerships between Teachers, and Promoting a Growth Mindset.

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.

The PLST will help provide resources to support teachers in collaboration and coaching cycles (by September 23rd). The SLT and PLST will work with department leaders to set goals and plan for differentiation, create an observation schedule, and de-brief with teachers to reflect on impacts (ongoing on a quarterly basis). The PLST team will offer or develop PD sessions in Growth Mindset practices to support all students (by October 5).

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

Before and after school tutoring will be targeted to lower performing students, with smaller group sizes, and will include peer tutoring supports.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The 2022 ELA proficiency across all grade levels was 82%. In FSA 6th grade Math, and EOC Algebra I and EOC Geometry proficiency across all grade levels was 81%. Proficiency in FSA 6th grade Math was 88%, in Algebra I it was 80%, and in Geometry it was 72% Across grade levels in ELA, the 6th graders outperformed the other grade levels with 86% proficiency, then 8th grade (84%), 9th grade (83%), 7th grade (82%), and then 10th (66%). Across grade levels in Math, the 6th graders outperformed the other grade levels with 88% proficiency, then 7th grade Algebra I (80%), 8th grade Geometry (72%). With regard to learning gains, ELA learning gains (66%) were lower than Math learning gains (74%). With regard to learning gains among the lowest performing quartile, ELA learning gains among the lowest performing quartile (64%) were lower than overall Math learning gains for lowest performing quartile (71%). In ELA, the proficiency data is as follows: ESE/SWD 45%, and ELL 10%. In Maths, the proficiency data is as follows: Math: ESE/SWD 67%, and ELL 0%. Based on the data, hands-on/in-person instruction was effective in increasing proficiency across-the-board. This increase was a result of returning to in-person learning. The critical need this year is improve proficiency in the high school grades, particularly the 10th-11th graders. and improving proficiency for the ESE/SWD and ELL subgroups. For the 2022-2023 school year, we will focus on differentiated instruction to improve learning outcomes for all students and to better target the unique needs of our high school population.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	With the implementation of differentiated instruction, an additional 10% of the 10th-11th graders will be proficient in FSA ELA (from 66% to 76%) and an additional 8% of the 8th graders will be proficient in the Geometry EOC (from 72% to 80%) as reflected in the end of year assessments. Additionally, proficiency for the ESE/SWD and ELL subgroups in both ELA and Math will increase by 5% for each group (ELA: ESE- from 45% to 50%; ELL- from 10% to 15%. Math: ESE- from 67% to 72%; ELL- 0% to 5%).
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Department chairs will conduct quarterly classroom walkthroughs to ensure that differentiation is aligned to current classroom and progress monitoring data, and making an impact. This will be embedded in the coaching model wherein teachers can be a part of goal-setting, planning, and post-observation discussions and reflection. An SLT member, Mrs. Baptiste, will meet with the chairs at least once quarterly to discuss observations and support implementation of the strategy. Student action plans will be developed for students not showing growth (including pull-outs/push-ins and tutoring). Administration will walkthrough to ensure fidelity of implementation.
Person responsible	Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

for monitoring outcome:	
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Differentiated instruction will be implemented to provide all students with increased opportunities for success. Differentiation will be implemented through content, process, and product.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Differentiation will ensure that a variety of learners can meet standards or make learning gains. Differentiation will be adjusted based on student needs as reflected in progress monitoring and in-class assessments.

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

9/6-9/9: Teachers will review in-class assessment and/or progress monitoring data with department leaders. As a result, department leaders will begin to identify deficient areas and struggling student groups requiring targeted differentiated instruction strategies.

Person Responsible	Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

On 9/13: Department leaders will discuss data with individual teachers to identify deficient areas and struggling student groups requiring targeted differentiated instruction strategies. As a result, teachers will plan differentiated instruction for identified students choosing a content, process, or product strategy to focus on during this implementation cycle.

Person Responsible	Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

9/14-10/7: Teachers, with department chairs and SLT/PLST support, will implement selected strategies as planned and observe impacts on student success. Administration will monitor and provide support through walkthroughs.

Person Responsible	Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

10/11: Teachers will discuss results with department leaders and adjust differentiated instruction plans as needed.

Person Responsible	Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16: Strengthen remediation based on math topic assessment, iReady AP1 diagnostic results and writing assessment. DI groups will now be formed outside the classroom as well.
-Math- Student groups will be formed based on topic assessment, iReady AP 1 diagnostic results and teacher-made assessment. Pull-out intervention and extended learning opportunities will be utilized to address deficiencies.
-ELA- Student groups will be formed based on iReady AP1 diagnostic result, writing assessment and teacher made assessment. Targeted resources will be used (B.E.S.T., iReady toolbox and writing samples) will be taught in during DI and extended learning opportunities.
-Extended learning: iReady after school tutoring for yellow and red students. Toolbox instructional will be used
-In order to meet the needs of students and ensure the level of student engagement is aligned to DI groups, teachers will plan with the end in mind (Backward planning). Teachers will plan and formulate H.O.T. questions.

Person Responsible   Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16: In order to meet the needs of students and ensure the level of student engagement is aligned to DI groups, teachers will plan with the end in mind (backward planning). Teachers will plan and formulate H.O.T. questions. Equity sticks will be utilized to check for understanding.

Person Responsible   Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The 2022 ELA proficiency across all grade levels was 82%. In FSA 6th grade Math, and EOC Algebra I and EOC Geometry proficiency across all grade levels was 81%. Proficiency in FSA 6th grade Math was 88%, in Algebra I it was 80%, and in Geometry it was 72% Across grade levels in ELA, the 6th graders outperformed the other grade levels with 86% proficiency, then 8th grade (84%), 9th grade (83%), 7th grade (82%), and then 10th (66%). Across grade levels in Math, the 6th graders outperformed the other grade levels with 88% proficiency, then 7th grade Algebra I (80%), 8th grade Geometry (72%). With regard to learning gains, ELA learning gains (66%) were lower than Math learning gains (74%). With regard to learning gains among the lowest performing quartile, ELA learning gains among the lowest performing quartile (64%) were lower than overall Math learning gains for lowest performing quartile (71%). In ELA, the proficiency data is as follows: ESE/SWD 45%, and ELL 10%. In Maths, the proficiency data is as follows: Math: ESE/SWD 67%, and ELL 0%. Based on the data, hands-on/in-person instruction was effective in increasing proficiency across-the-board. This increase was a result of returning to in-person learning. The critical need this year is to improve proficiency in the high school grades, particularly the 10th-11th graders. and improving proficiency for the ESE/SWD and ELL subgroups. For the 2022-2023 school year, we will also focus on instructional support/coaching to improve instruction and learning outcomes for all students and to better target the unique needs of our high school population.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	With the implementation of instructional support/coaching, an additional 10% of the 10th-11th graders will be proficient in FSA ELA (from 66% to 76%) and an additional 8% of the 8th graders will be proficient in the Geometry EOC (from 72% to 80%) as reflected in the end of year assessments. Additionally, proficiency for the ESE/SWD and ELL subgroups in both ELA and Math will increase by 5% for each group (ELA: ESE- from 45% to 50%; ELL- from 10% to 15%. Math: ESE- from 67% to 72%; ELL- 0% to 5%).
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Departments will meet monthly to engage in the coaching cycle to set goals incorporating a differentiated instruction strategy in the classroom and make a plan for implementation. Department chairs will support and observe teachers to encourage engagement of the teaching strategy. After a period of implementation, departments will reflect on the use of differentiated instruction and student success. Student action plans will be developed for students not showing growth (including pull-outs/push-ins and tutoring).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategy of Instructional Support/Coaching will be implemented to provide instructors with support for using differentiation in the classroom. Coaching cycles will

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	engage teachers in goal-setting, planning, and post-observation discussions and reflection.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Instructional Support/Coaching will ensure that teachers will collaborate and ensure that a variety of learners will be able to benefit from differentiation. Through the coaching cycle, teachers will evaluate the data from progress monitoring to reflect on student success and student needs. Teachers with awareness of differentiation will be able to impart their best practices in the classroom and adjustments to instructions will be made to reach all learners.

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

8/12-8/16: As a school, the goal of using differentiation in the classroom as an instructional strategy will be explored and, through departments, teachers will set up dates for baseline assessments/ progress monitoring to gather initial data. (Identify mentors to coach and assign mentees – lead mentor Dr. Buncher)

Person Responsible	Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

9/13: Teachers will then be prepared to share data and use it to identify deficient content areas and struggling student groups requiring targeted differentiated instruction strategies. Teachers will apply the content, process, or product differentiation to improve student learning outcomes for the targeted group.

Person Responsible	Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

9/14-9/15: Teachers will conduct data chats with students about baseline results, set goals, and come up with a more specific plan for differentiation/support. Teachers, with support of the SLT team, will communicate results with the counselors and parents within an agreed upon time frame. Dates of lessons may also be discussed informally with department chairs as to when it is best to observe the class.

Person Responsible	Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

9/16-10/7: Department chairs will observe teachers briefly, 10-15 minutes, on the use of differentiation strategies. Informal post-discussion meetings will take place to review strategies used and teacher observations of student success.

Person Responsible	Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

10/11: Teachers will reflect on results from using differentiated instruction with department chairs and adjust plans as needed.

Person Responsible	Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16: After desegregating data (student & teacher data chats), strategic DI groups will be readjusted to meet changing student needs or to better address persistent deficiencies.

Person Responsible   Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16: Potential barriers to student success will be evaluated and new or additional DI strategies will be implemented within classrooms, during pull-out interventions, and in the after school program.

Person Responsible   Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

#3. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	The 2022 ELA proficiency across all grade levels was 82%. In FSA 6th grade Math, and EOC Algebra I and EOC Geometry proficiency across all grade levels was 81%. Proficiency in FSA 6th grade Math was 88%, in Algebra I it was 80%, and in Geometry it was 72% Across grade levels in ELA, the 6th graders outperformed the other grade levels with 86% proficiency, then 8th grade (84%), 9th grade (83%), 7th grade (82%), and then 10th (66%). Across grade levels in Math, the 6th graders outperformed the other grade levels with 88% proficiency, then 7th grade Algebra I (80%), 8th grade Geometry (72%). With regard to learning gains, ELA learning gains (66%) were lower than Math learning gains (74%). With regard to learning gains among the lowest performing quartile, ELA learning gains among the lowest performing quartile (64%) were lower than overall Math learning gains for lowest performing quartile (71%). In ELA, the proficiency data is as follows: ESE/SWD 45%, and ELL 10%. In Maths, the proficiency data is as follows: Math: ESE/SWD 67%, and ELL 0%. Based on the data, hands-on/in-person instruction was effective in increasing proficiency across-the-board. This increase was a result of returning to in-person learning. The critical need this year is improve proficiency in the high school grades, particularly the 10th-11th graders. and improving proficiency for the ESE/SWD and ELL subgroups. For the 2022-2023 school year, we will focus on creating mentorships/partnerships between teachers to improve learning outcomes for all students and to better target the unique needs of our high school population.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	With the implementation of mentorships/partnerhips, an additional 10% of the 10th-11th graders will be proficient in FSA ELA (from 66% to 76%) and an additional 8% of the 8th graders will be proficient in the Geometry EOC (from 72% to 80%) as reflected in the end of year assessments. Additionally, proficiency for the ESE/SWD and ELL subgroups in both ELA and Math will increase by 5% for each group (ELA: ESE- from 45% to 50%; ELL- from 10% to 15%. Math: ESE- from 67% to 72%; ELL- 0% to 5%).
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The PLST Lead Mentor, in collaboration with teachers, will create a mentorship framework for the school based on school data and teacher feedback. Mentors and mentees will support each other in developing lesson plans that integrate student data and differentiation strategies. Mentors and mentees will reflect on student outcomes periodically.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Annette Collazo (acollazo@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based**	Our school will focus will be on creating mentorship and partnerships between teachers to ensure that teachers are supported within a collegial framework in order to meet student needs.

strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Teacher mentorships and partnerships will create safe spaces and opportunities to share ideas and expertise, and will lead to a sharing of responsibility for student learning. This in turn will result in improved instruction, making learning accessible for all students, therefore increasing student achievement.

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

8/15-9/9: The PLST Lead Mentor, in collaboration with teachers, will create a mentorship framework for the school based on school data and teacher feedback.

Person Responsible	Annette Collazo (acollazo@dadeschools.net)

8/22-10/7: Mentors and mentees will support each other in developing lesson plans that integrate student data and differentiation strategies.

Person Responsible	Annette Collazo (acollazo@dadeschools.net)

By 10/7: Mentors and mentees will attend a mentorship program meeting to receive support. The program will match teachers based on the mentees needs in pedagogy or classroom management.

Person Responsible	Annette Collazo (acollazo@dadeschools.net)

By 10/7: Mentors and mentees will reflect on the collaboration, and reach out to the PLST Lead Mentor and administration for support as needed.

Person Responsible	Annette Collazo (acollazo@dadeschools.net)

10/31- 12/16: Mentors and mentees, our Lead Mentor, and the PD Liaison will work together to develop and propose a PLC. The PLC will allow each mentor-mentee partnership to share their learning with other mentor-mentee partnerships and with the larger staff, thereby developing others and building greater capacity within the entire faculty.

Person Responsible	Annette Collazo (acollazo@dadeschools.net)

10/31- 12/16: Two mentors/mentees will present to their work to the PLC and the faculty in an authentic exchange of best practices which will increase collective efficacy and self-efficacy.

Person Responsible	Annette Collazo (acollazo@dadeschools.net)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Engaging Learning Environment and Relationships	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The 2022 ELA proficiency across all grade levels was 82%. In FSA 6th grade Math, and EOC Algebra I and EOC Geometry proficiency across all grade levels was 81%. Proficiency in FSA 6th grade Math was 88%, in Algebra I it was 80%, and in Geometry it was 72% Across grade levels in ELA, the 6th graders outperformed the other grade levels with 86% proficiency, then 8th grade (84%), 9th grade (83%), 7th grade (82%), and then 10th (66%). Across grade levels in Math, the 6th graders outperformed the other grade levels with 88% proficiency, then 7th grade Algebra I (80%), 8th grade Geometry (72%). With regard to learning gains, ELA learning gains (66%) were lower than Math learning gains (74%). With regard to learning gains among the lowest performing quartile, ELA learning gains among the lowest performing quartile (64%) were lower than overall Math learning gains for lowest performing quartile (71%). In ELA, the proficiency data is as follows: ESE/SWD 45%, and ELL 10%. In Maths, the proficiency data is as follows: Math: ESE/SWD 67%, and ELL 0%. Based on the data, hands-on/in-person instruction was effective in increasing proficiency across-the-board. This increase was a result of returning to in-person learning. The critical need this year is improve proficiency in the high school grades, particularly the 10th-11th graders. and improving proficiency for the ESE/SWD and ELL subgroups. For the 2022-2023 school year, we will focus on promoting a growth mindset for all teachers and students and to better target the unique needs of our high school population.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	With the implementation of a growth mindset program, an additional 10% of the 10th-11th graders will be proficient in FSA ELA (from 66% to 76%) and an additional 8% of the 10th-11th graders will be proficient in the Geometry EOC (from 72% to 80%) as reflected in the end of year assessments. Additionally, proficiency for the ESE/SWD and ELL subgroups in both ELA and Math will increase by 5% for each group.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The SLT team, the counselor, and student services support team will help plan, implement, and assess a growth mindset program.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lorena Treto (ltreto@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Within the area of positive culture and environment, we will focus on Promoting a Growth Mindset as a strategy that will support both teaching and learning.

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Promoting a growth mindset is a strategy that increases teacher and student motivation and resilience by building a learner's sense of efficacy. This increased sense of self-efficacy results in increased achievement over time and support student social and emotional growth.

Action Steps to Implement

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

8/12-8/15: Teachers will discuss the growth mindset strategy and reflect on their classroom environment and student feedback methods as they plan for the school year.

Person Responsible	Lorena Treto (ltreto@dadeschools.net)

8/17-9/9: The Student Support Services team and student leaders will help plan a school-wide growth mindset program.

Person Responsible	Lorena Treto (ltreto@dadeschools.net)

10/5: Teachers will participate in a PD on the growth mindset as it relates to teacher self-care and classroom practices and share at the following faculty meeting.

Person Responsible	Lorena Treto (ltreto@dadeschools.net)

10/6-10/14: The Student Support Services team and student leaders will help assess the program thus far and plan for further activities throughout the school day and faculty meetings. An in-house student survey will measure the impact of the program and suggest areas for improvement.

Person Responsible	Lorena Treto (ltreto@dadeschools.net)

10/31- 12/16: To further support the growth mindset program, the Student Support Services team and student leaders will focus on building resiliency and self-advocacy skills. These skills will aid students in developing and maintaining a growth mindset in and out of school.

Person Responsible	Lorena Treto (ltreto@dadeschools.net)

10/31- 12/16: The team will continue to evaluate the program and plan activities for the return from Winter Break to re-energize and academically re-engage students, and reconnect with students as a school community for the second half of the school year.

Person Responsible	Lorena Treto (ltreto@dadeschools.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

Our strengths within school culture are in Relationships; Support, Care, and Connections; Engaging Learning Environment. Our school Celebrates Successes in weekly announcements, on social media, and within the classroom with recognitions such as student of the month awards and quarterly certificates. We also hold many events for students to take pride in their achievements and celebrate together. These events include field trips and lunch time celebrations led by the Activities Director.

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

The stakeholders involved in building a positive school culture and environment include the School Leadership Team members. The principal guides positive school culture by developing and empowering leaders to pursue projects and take initiatives that help build a positive school culture and environment. The assistant principal helps ensure that support and resources are available for leaders and teachers to meet goals. The lead magnet teacher provides support for teaching and learning. The school counselor helps ensure that we meet the needs of all of our students. Our teacher leader helps align realities in the classroom with school goals. The PD Liaison helps ensure that teachers have opportunities to participate in PDs that help build a positive classroom and school culture.