

Broward County Public Schools

Miramar High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	8
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Miramar High School

3601 SW 89TH AVE, MIRAMAR, FL 33025

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Broward County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Formoso, Maria	Principal	Oversees implementation of School Improvement Plan.
Winter, Shelly	Assistant Principal	Oversees English and reading teachers who work with students on literacy skills; ensures students receive the services they need.
Bergeron, Kaila	Assistant Principal	Oversees teachers who work with English language learners students to ensure students receive the services they need.
Murray, John	Assistant Principal	Oversees ESE teachers that work with students with disabilities on social skills and curriculum; ensures students receive the services they need.
Basulto-Arencibia, Gloria	Assistant Principal	Oversees math teachers that work with students with disabilities on math skills; ensures students receive the services they need.
Fernandez, Jason	Teacher, K-12	SAC Co-Chair The Co-Chair is responsible for notifying members of upcoming meetings and votes, facilitate the SAC meetings, helps draft and monitor the SIP and informs the SAC of relevant issues related to school improvement activities.
Davis, Tonya	Teacher, K-12	SAC Co-Chair The Co-Chair is responsible for notifying members of upcoming meetings and votes, facilitate the SAC meetings, helps draft and monitor the SIP and informs the SAC of relevant issues related to school improvement activities.
March, Ryan	Assistant Principal	Oversees social studies teachers who work with students on literacy skills; ensures students receive the services they need.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

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

Discussion of the school improvement plan is a continuous discussion throughout the school year with the faculty, staff and School Advisory Council. Their input is collected to set student achievement goals.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

We will visit the SIP after FAST PMs 1 and 2 in reading and math to monitor progress and the impact on student achievement. Necessary revisions to our action steps will be made based on data and all relevant factors that align to decisions that maximize student achievement and continuous improvement.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	96%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	93%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	39	50	50	34	52	51	39		
ELA Learning Gains				41			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			37		
Math Achievement*	26	36	38	16	41	38	11		
Math Learning Gains				36			17		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			31		
Science Achievement*	39	60	64	35	35	40	35		
Social Studies Achievement*	60	66	66	58	51	48	48		
Middle School Acceleration					50	44			
Graduation Rate	94	90	89	94	54	61	95		
College and Career Acceleration	62	61	65	58	66	67	68		
ELP Progress	31	50	45	47			42		

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	351
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	94

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	510
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	94

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	4	
ELL	38	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	48			
HSP	53			
MUL	40	Yes	2	
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	48			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	3	
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	63			
BLK	44			
HSP	49			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	47			
FRL	45			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	39			26			39	60		94	62	31
SWD	27			15			19	26		36	6	
ELL	25			16			12	35		64	7	31
AMI												
ASN	60							82		100	4	
BLK	38			25			39	57		59	7	24
HSP	45			26			41	67		68	7	36
MUL	40			40							2	
PAC												
WHT	36			47			42	71		80	6	
FRL	34			24			34	58		60	7	31

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	34	41	43	16	36	48	35	58		94	58	47
SWD	16	33	19	16	33	40	16	32		91	27	
ELL	15	35	43	11	35	46	18	47		85	38	47
AMI												
ASN	57	43		33	50					92	100	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	33	40	41	14	35	49	33	57		95	55	35
HSP	37	46	44	23	41	39	42	60		94	58	54
MUL	20	17		14	23					93	71	
PAC												
WHT	46	44		17	30		36	67		76	63	
FRL	31	39	42	16	35	47	32	59		94	57	45

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	39	43	37	11	17	31	35	48		95	68	42
SWD	17	31	21	6	23	35	15	24		87	33	
ELL	17	42	46	7	19	21	27	43		90	75	42
AMI												
ASN	73	85		55	30			70		100	93	
BLK	38	43	42	9	16	29	34	45		96	65	48
HSP	32	39	22	14	27	39	29	58		88	78	34
MUL				0	20					91	90	
PAC												
WHT	56	49		28	8		47	50		93	77	38
FRL	36	42	35	10	16	30	32	44		94	66	38

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

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	41%	49%	-8%	50%	-9%
09	2023 - Spring	34%	49%	-15%	48%	-14%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	34%	48%	-14%	50%	-16%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	23%	46%	-23%	48%	-25%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	36%	63%	-27%	63%	-27%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	58%	62%	-4%	63%	-5%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Math Achievement shows the lowest performance, which is 29%. Although this category displays the lowest performance in comparison of all the other school data category, this component reflected an increase of 13% points. Coming off a pandemic, many students lack the testing stamina needed to be successful. Students also lack mastery of key concepts needed to achieve a level three score or higher on the newly designed state assessments and standards.

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

The largest decline was that our graduation rate declined by 0.2 from the previous school year. A major factor was the higher concordant scores that was implemented with this cohort of students.

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

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state's average is Biology. There was a gap of 27% points. Coming off a pandemic, many students lack the testing stamina needed to be successful. Students also lack mastery of key concepts needed to achieve a level three score or higher on the state assessment and standards.

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

Math achievement showed the most improvement. The new actions that we took in this area were that we monitored student progress utilizing common formative assessments, provided remediation for students that show deficiency on common formative assessments, increased academic support for students in Math courses, ensured students are socially and emotionally supported to meet academic success, assigned one of our assistant principals strictly over teaching and learning, and utilized Professional Learning Communities to common plan and analyzed data.

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

NOTE: The Early Warning Systems section and this corresponding question are no longer required to be completed for grades 9-12 for the State SIP, per the Florida Department of Education.

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

- 1- Graduation
- 2- Biology Scores
- 3- ELA L25 Learning Gains
- 4- Math LG
- 5- Acceleration

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students with disabilities are at 32% per the Federal Index. They struggle to synthesize information across multiple subjects, through various platforms. Additionally, they do not perform well on high-stakes testing. ELL students are at 38% per the Federal Index, and Multiracial students are at 40% per the Federal Index.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By May 2024, 9th and 10th grade ELL, Multiracial, and Students with Disabilities will demonstrate (41%) proficiency per the Federal Percent of Points Index in English Language Arts and Math as measured by the FAST.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Student progress in ELA will be progress monitored by teachers utilizing the Into Literature curriculum.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Murray (john.murray@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

In order to accommodate ELL, Multiracial and Students with Disabilities, we will attempt to break material down into smaller segments, in small group settings. We will utilize various instructional methods such as scaffolding and chunking to assist students in attaining mastery of previously taught material. Periodically students will be tested to assess their level of mastery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale is based on data scores that reflect the success of reinforcing material through small group instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

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

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

By When: Ongoing thru May 30, 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of focus will be to retain 85% of the 23-24 SY faculty for the 24-25 SY. This is a crucial need for our school and students, because poor teacher retention has been shown to negatively impact students' educational achievement and school success.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By July 1, 2024, 85% or more of the current faculty will be retained for the 24-25 SY.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored quarterly through the collection and tracking data aligned to the number of teachers we retain and the number that transfer to another school within the school district.

Note: We do not have control over teachers who leave due to moving to another city/county.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Murray (john.murray@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

To retain our teachers we will:

1. Cultivate Collaboration - Provided opportunities for teachers to engage and collaborate with one another.
2. Empower Teachers to Succeed - Provide opportunities for teachers to participate in professional development to improve their teaching skills and boost their confidence, and give them the resources they need to be successful.
3. Provide Support - Provide opportunities for teachers to express their opinions and concerns, feel included and receive mentoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to various research, networking among teachers has been proven to increase retention rates. When teachers have self-efficacy, they are more likely to continue teaching. Also, the level of support that teachers receive can make a huge difference in the way they feel about their jobs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

1. Plan meetings where teachers of the same subject and/or grade levels can come together and discuss their ideas for the classroom and subjects.

2. Pair new teachers with experienced mentors.
3. Encourage networking among all teachers, whether in person or online.

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

By When: By September 2023

4. Provide opportunities for teachers to participate in professional development.
5. Provide opportunities for teachers to express their opinions and concerns.

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

By When: Ongoing

6. Collect, discuss and track teacher retention data (including the progress of the strategies).

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

By When: Quarterly, End of year, June 2024 and Beginning of year, August 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Funding and resources will be used to provide students with interventions based on school Common Formative Assessment data and FAST PM1 and PM2 data. Funding requests are brought to School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings and discussed. Rationales for the requests and supports are provided at the meeting. The council has open discussions about the requests, then vote to approve or deny the funding requests.