

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Cutler Bay Senior 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 | 11 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 0 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Cutler Bay Senior High School

8601 SW 212TH ST, Cutler Bay, FL 33189

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Dade County School Board on 10/11/2023.

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.

Cutler Bay Senior High School pledges to provide a learning environment with an engaging, innovative curriculum that exposes students to critical thinking, technology, field studies, projects, and research. Cutler Bay Senior High School is committed to providing a challenging program that prepares our students for an evolving global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cutler Bay Senior High School strives to be a safe, nurturing, and supportive learning community where each student achieves literacy. We are dedicated to engaging students and to creating lifelong learners who will contribute positively to society. Cutler Bay Senior High School embodies the belief that through high standards and expectations, all students can learn and achieve mastery.

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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| De La Torre, Lucas | Principal | Mr. De La Torre is the Principal of Cutler Bay Senior High School. He is involved in all aspects of the safe and effective maintenance of the school and its programs. He works closely with the School Leadership Team in the creation and implementation of the School Improvement Plan with fidelity. |
| Clarit, Michelle | Assistant Principal | Ms. Clarit is the Assistant Principal of Curriculum at Cutler Bay Senior High. She works closely with academy lead teachers and with department heads to identify curriculum goals and needs. She is central to the composition and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. Ms. Clarit will be responsible for monitoring the outcomes of the SIP. |
| McCoy, Christy | Teacher, K-12 | Ms. McCoy is the ELA Department chair. She focuses on reading and writing strategies across the curriculum. She is responsible for disaggregating the Midyear and Annual data to determine the remediation needs of the curriculum standards. |
| Delgado, Maria | Teacher, K-12 | Ms. Delgado is a representative of the science department. She is proficient in instructional technology and has provided support to peers in the implementation of digital platforms. She will assist her department chair in the dissemination of the strategies outlined by the SIP. |
| Verger, Sebastian | Teacher, K-12 | Mr. Verger represents the Social Science Department as the Department Chair. He will identify the curriculum and resource needs in his department. He has strong knowledge base across the social sciences and provides support to his department members. He will disseminate the strategies outlined by the SIP to his department. |
| Ruffo, Marshall | Teacher, K-12 | Mr. Ruffo represents the Science Department as the Department Chair. He will identify the curriculum and resource needs in his department. He has a strong knowledge base across the sciences and provides support to his department members. He will disseminate the strategies outlined by the SIP to his department. |
| Rahouly, Maria | Magnet Coordinator | Ms. Rahouly is the Math Department Chair, the Lead Academy Teacher, and the Cambridge Coordinator for our school. She works with all curriculum and professional development needs for the Cambridge program. She also has extensive knowledge of Mathematics and identifies curricular needs for the Math department. She will disseminate the strategies outlined by the SIP. |
| Janata, Cheryl | Teacher, K-12 | Ms. Janata is the head of the Math department. She instructs the Algebra 1 course which is a graduation requirement for the state. She will assist here Department chair in the dissemination of the strategies outlined by the SIP. |

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.

Our EESAC committee is comprised of our stakeholders including administration, teachers, school staff, parents, and students. We meet a minimum of four times a year. In every meeting, an aspect of the SIP is reviewed and approved. This allows the opportunity for the committee to reflect on the SIP goals and our progress towards meeting them.

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))

The SIP will be monitored monthly by the leadership team through classroom walkthroughs, dissection of data from student progress assessments, staff feedback, and parent input. Adjustments to the SIP will be made by the leadership team if there is a targeted goal that is not meeting the growth expectations.

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 | 85% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 59% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | N/A |
| 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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: A 2019-20: A |

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| | 2018-19: A 2017-18: A |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 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 |

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 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 | |

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 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 |

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* | 76 | 55 | 50 | 82 | 54 | 51 | 84 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 66 | | | 60 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 70 | | | 68 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 73 | 43 | 38 | 73 | 42 | 38 | 63 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 76 | | | 27 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 70 | | | 39 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 93 | 62 | 64 | 75 | 41 | 40 | 79 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 94 | 69 | 66 | 100 | 56 | 48 | 94 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 56 | 44 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | 100 | 89 | 89 | 100 | 56 | 61 | 100 | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | 84 | 70 | 65 | 88 | 67 | 67 | 85 | | |
| ELP Progress | | 49 | 45 | | | | | | |

* 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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 87 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 520 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | 100 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 80 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 800 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | 100 |

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 | 64 | | | |
| ELL | 54 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 92 | | | |
| HSP | 85 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 91 | | | |

| 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% |
| FRL | 84 | | | |

| 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 | 58 | | | |
| ELL | 71 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 82 | | | |
| HSP | 80 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 84 | | | |
| FRL | 81 | | | |

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 | 76 | | | 73 | | | 93 | 94 | | 100 | 84 | |
| SWD | 53 | | | 50 | | | | 90 | | | 3 | |
| ELL | 43 | | | 47 | | | | 73 | | | 3 | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 93 | | | 90 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| HSP | 73 | | | 70 | | | 91 | 93 | | 82 | 6 | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 85 | | | 79 | | | 100 | 100 | | 81 | 6 | |
| FRL | 70 | | | 72 | | | 92 | 88 | | 83 | 6 | |

| 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 | 82 | 66 | 70 | 73 | 76 | 70 | 75 | 100 | | 100 | 88 | |
| SWD | 67 | 67 | | 40 | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 54 | 56 | 53 | 64 | 81 | | 57 | | | 100 | 100 | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 73 | 64 | | | | | | | | 100 | 90 | |
| HSP | 81 | 67 | 69 | 71 | 78 | 70 | 75 | 100 | | 100 | 88 | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 89 | 63 | | 83 | 75 | | 75 | 100 | | 100 | 83 | |
| FRL | 81 | 69 | 71 | 75 | 74 | 71 | 75 | 100 | | 100 | 89 | |

| 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 | 84 | 60 | 68 | 63 | 27 | 39 | 79 | 94 | | 100 | 85 | |
| SWD | 53 | 43 | | 58 | 30 | | 60 | | | | | |
| ELL | 65 | 53 | | 40 | | | | | | 100 | 93 | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 75 | 64 | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 84 | 59 | 69 | 57 | 30 | 32 | 74 | 92 | | 100 | 85 | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 87 | 60 | | 83 | 13 | | 90 | 97 | | 100 | 80 | |
| FRL | 81 | 60 | 66 | 59 | 30 | 37 | 80 | 94 | | 100 | 84 | |

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 | 76% | 54% | 22% | 50% | 26% |
| 09 | 2023 - Spring | 77% | 51% | 26% | 48% | 29% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 66% | 56% | 10% | 50% | 16% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 79% | 52% | 27% | 48% | 31% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 90% | 65% | 25% | 63% | 27% |

| HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 94% | 66% | 28% | 63% | 31% |

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.

The data component with the lowest performance was the Algebra I EOC. In 2023 the proficiency score on the Algebra EOC was 66%. This is a decline from the proficiency score of 71% from the 2022 school year.

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

The data component with the greatest decline from the prior year was the overall ELA proficiency of 83% versus 77% for the 2023 school year. There was a decline of six percentage points. Some of the factors that contributed to this decline was the introduction of the new F.A.S.T. Assessment and an increase of level one and level two students in ninth and tenth grade.

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 compared to the state average was the Geometry EOC. The students performed 31% above the state average on this assessment. The factors that contributed to this outcome were after-school tutoring began earlier in the year and boot camp was implemented which was not done before for Geometry.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the Biology EOC. It increased from 75% in 2022 to 90% in the 2023 school year. This is a 15% increase in proficiency. The teacher provided bimonthly assessments to reconfigure DI groups to address remediation for weak benchmarks. The teacher increased hands-on labs and Gizmos simulated labs to reinforce whole group benchmarks in need of remediation.

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

One potential area of concern is the number of students in our ELA population who have scored a level one or level two on the ELA exam. These students need additional remediation and resources. The school will provide additional resources through extended school learning opportunities.

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

The highest priority for school improvement is to raise our ELA proficiency on the F.A.S.T. exam.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

According to the 2023 ELA F.A.S.T. PM3 data for 9th grade, 77% of the 9th grade students were proficient in ELA as compared to the 2022 ELA FSA exam of 88%. Based on the identified contributing factors of an increased number of students entering who are in need of reading intervention and an increase in the number of English Language Learners, we will implement the Targeted Element of Intervention.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of differentiation of instruction and reading remediation activities outside of the classroom, there will be a 3% increase in the number of students who show proficiency on the 2024 PM3 ELA F.A.S.T. Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The administration will look for evidence of DI group instruction by conducting classroom visitations, reviewing lesson plans, and surveying student work samples.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Clarit (clarit7@dadeschools.net)

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.)

Data-driven decisions on the formation of DI groups in the ELA classroom will be made based on the outcome of the PM1 and PM2 progress monitoring data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By targeting the weak benchmarks as evidence by the PM data, the students will gain proficiency in these targeted areas, thereby strengthening their reading skills across the curriculum.

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.

9/5 With the completion of the PM1 ELA F.A.S.T. Exam, the teachers will create DI groups to provide intervention for benchmarks in need of remediation. As a result, students will receive support to achieve reading proficiency in the identified areas of weakness.

Person Responsible: Michelle Clarit (clarit7@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/22/2023

09/25 With the completion of the PM1 ELA F.A.S.T. exam, the extended learning opportunity of after-school tutoring will be offered to students who are not proficient on the PM1 ELA F.A.S.T. exam. As a result, students will receive support to achieve reading proficiency in the identified areas of weakness.

Person Responsible: Michelle Clarit (clarit7@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/29/23

09/29/23 With the completion of the PM1 ELA F.A.S.T. exam, the teacher will conduct data chats with the students to identify targeted benchmarks in need of remediation. As a result, students will receive support to achieve reading proficiency in the identified areas of weakness.

Person Responsible: Michelle Clarit (clarit7@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/29/23

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

According to the 2023 ELA F.A.S.T. PM3 data for 10th grade, 76% of the 10th grade students were proficient in ELA as compared to the 2022 ELA FSA exam of 77%. Based on the identified contributing factors of an increased number of students entering who are in need of reading intervention and an increase in the number of English Language Learners, we will implement the Targeted Element of Intervention.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of differentiation of instruction and reading remediation activities outside of the classroom, there will be a 3% increase in the number of students who show proficiency on the 2024 PM3 ELA F.A.S.T. Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The administration will look for evidence of DI group instruction by conducting classroom visitations, by reviewing lesson plans, and by surveying student work samples.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Clarit (clarit7@dadeschools.net)

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.)

Data-driven decisions on the formation of DI groups in the ELA classroom will be made based on the outcome of the PM1 and PM2 progress monitoring data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By targeting the weak benchmarks as evidence by the PM data, the students will gain proficiency in these targeted areas, thereby, strengthening their reading skills across the curriculum.

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.

9/5 With the completion of the PM1 ELA F.A.S.T. Exam, the teachers will create DI groups to provide intervention for benchmarks in need of remediation. As a result, students will receive support to achieve reading proficiency in the identified areas of weakness.

Person Responsible: Michelle Clarit (clarit7@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/05/23

09/29 With the completion of the PM1 ELA F.A.S.T. Exam, the teacher will conduct data chats with the students to identify targeted benchmarks in need of remediation. As a result, students will receive support to achieve reading proficiency in the identified areas of weakness.

Person Responsible: Michelle Clarit (clarit7@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/29/23

09/29 With the completion of the PM1 ELA F.A.S.T. Exam, the extended learning opportunity of after-school tutoring will be offered to students who are not proficient on the PM1 ELA F.A.S.T. exam. As a result, students will receive support to achieve reading proficiency in the identified areas of weakness.

Person Responsible: Michelle Clarit (clarit7@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/29/23

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

According to the 2022-2023 attendance data, 38% of the students were absent 0-5 days from school. This has increased in comparison to 2021-2022 where 35% of the students were absent 0-5 days from school. Attendance to school is directly correlated to academic success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of attendance intervention, there will be a 1% decrease in the category of students who are absent 0-5 days from school.

Monitoring:

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

Tracking the EWS indicators will assist in monitoring our possible at-students. This will involve tracking attendance, grades, behavior, and other indicators to assess whether the interventions are positively impacting student outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Clarit (clarit7@dadeschools.net)

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.)

Poor attendance correlates with limited academic success, and an increased potential for students to drop out. By using the Response to Early Warning System to track students who may need intervention with school attendance, we can better support them in attending class regularly, thereby increasing their chance for academic success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Early Warning System (EWS) are designed to establish a comprehensive system based on student data, enabling the identification of students who display behaviors or academic performance that may put them at-risk of dropping out. By utilizing predictive data, these systems can effectively identify students who are off-track or at-risk, allowing for targeted interventions and support. Furthermore, these systems can reveal patterns and root causes, providing valuable insights into the underlying factors contributing to poor student performance. Overall, EWS plays a crucial role in improving student outcomes, and increasing the likelihood of their academic success.

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.

08/17/23

Student contracts outlining the attendance expectations and policies will be disseminated via student packets at the beginning of the school year during homeroom. As a result, students will acknowledge awareness of school attendance expectations and signed attendance contracts will be kept on file in the attendance office.

Person Responsible: Michelle Clarit (clarit7@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/25/23

08/28/23

The administration will review the attendance policy and procedures at the grade-level orientations. As a result, the students will become aware of the policy, and the connection between attendance and academic success.

Person Responsible: Michelle Clarit (clarit7@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/08/23

08/17/23

The daily attendance bulletin will be reviewed and any student with two or three absences will receive a parent phone call home. Those with five or more will have a parent conference with the attendance committee and placed on an attendance contract. As a result, parent support will be garnered in an attempt to improve the student's attendance and overall academic success.

Person Responsible: Michelle Clarit (clarit7@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/29/23

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

According to the staff climate survey from the 2022-2023 school year, 52% of teachers reported that they strongly agreed with the statement "professional development opportunities keep me informed of the latest educational strategies." This is a 35% decline from the previous school year. During the 2021-2022, 87% of the staff strongly agreed with this statement. This data is noteworthy because we want our teachers to feel their time in the professional development session is valued and meaningful to their own professional growth.

Measurable Outcome:

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

There will be a 3% increase in the number of teachers who report that they strongly agree with the statement "professional development opportunities keep me informed of the latest educational strategies" on the 2023-2024 staff climate survey.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored by a pre and post-survey regarding professional development activities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Clarit (clarit7@dadeschools.net)

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.)

The teachers are being empowered to voice their needs for specific professional development activities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By allowing the teachers to provide feedback for professional development needs, the administration will be able to facilitate meaningful learning activities. This will empower teachers to hone their craft to provide engaging and effective lessons to their students.

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.

08/14/23 A professional development interest survey will be administered to the staff during the opening of school meeting for the 2023-2024 school year. As a result, the administration will be made aware of the professional development needs of the faculty.

Person Responsible: Michelle Clarit (clarit7@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/2023

09/02/23 Based on the outcome of the teacher professional development interest survey, the leadership team will align professional development activities that are aligned with teacher interest. As a result, the teachers will feel they are engaged in meaningful learning activities.

Person Responsible: Michelle Clarit (clarit7@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/02/23

09/15/23 Teacher feedback after the initial PD activity of the year will be collected to consider adjustments needed for future Professional Development activities. As a result, changes can be made to create impactful PD activities.

Person Responsible: Michelle Clarit (clarit7@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/29/23