Miami-Dade County Public Schools

American Senior High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

American Senior High School

18350 NW 67TH AVE, Hialeah, FL 33015

http://american.dade.k12.fl.us/

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.

The mission of American Senior High School is to partner with business and community members, parents, and students to provide a safe and quality learning environment. We promote academic, intellectual, personal, and social development of our diverse population in preparation for college and career pathways.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of American Senior High School is to inspire and prepare our students for a competitive global community. We will instill in them critical thinking skills, a desire for learning, and a respect for the core values of integrity, compassion, and perseverance.

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
Papp, Stephen	Principal	Principal - Oversee the daily functions of the school and ensure that students are receiving a quality education in a safe environment.
Garbutt, Ursula	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal – Assist the principal in overseeing the daily functions of the school and ensure that students are receiving a quality education in a safe environment.
Gonzalez, Rafael	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal – Assist the principal in overseeing the daily functions of the school and ensure that students are receiving a quality education in a safe environment.
Ramos, Tangela	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal – Assist the principal in overseeing the daily functions of the school and ensure that students are receiving a quality education in a safe environment.
Munoz, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	English Teacher - Instruct students using standards-based instruction.
Gibson, Raquel	Teacher, K-12	Math Teacher - Instruct students using standards-based instruction.
Flores, Damian	Teacher, Career/Technical	CTE Teacher - Instruct students using standards-based instruction; PLST member (Digital Innovator).

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.

The process for involving stakeholders as it relates to the SIP development process at American Senior High School was to ensure all stakeholders voices' were heard. We were able to establish this collaboration through ESSAC, Department Meetings, Faculty Meetings, and Grade Level Meetings. Their collective input was used to identify the various school needs from the perspective of each stakeholder to ensure all strategies were aligned to the school 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))

Common planning sessions will be used to debrief and progress-monitor weekly in order to ensure that the teaching materials created and assessment measures were effective regardless of differences in ability. Administrative walkthroughs will also be conducted by the leadership team with the respective look-fors discussed during common planning and to ensure fidelity and alignment to the SIP. Leadership team will monitor as they build capacity during the Knowledge Swap walkthroughs with the ELA department.

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 PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	99%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	95%
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) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: B

	2019-20: C
*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2018-19: C
	2017-18: C
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	
One or more suspensions	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	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	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	

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	
Students retained two or more times	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	486
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	254
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	321
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	495
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	634

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	658

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	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
					Grade Level					
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	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*	42	55	50	35	54	51	34		
ELA Learning Gains				47			35		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			26		
Math Achievement*	33	43	38	37	42	38	24		
Math Learning Gains				60			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			30		
Science Achievement*	55	62	64	49	41	40	42		
Social Studies Achievement*	68	69	66	72	56	48	44		
Middle School Acceleration					56	44			
Graduation Rate	96	89	89	97	56	61	93		
College and Career Acceleration	68	70	65	67	67	67	65		
ELP Progress	35	49	45	40			32		

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	397
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	96

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	606
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	97

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	44			
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	63			
HSP	56			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	87			

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	56			

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	43			
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	58			
HSP	54			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	55			

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	42			33			55	68		96	68	35
SWD	25			25			35	49		28	6	
ELL	17			27			41	35		63	7	35
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42			31			57	73		76	6	
HSP	43			34			52	65		64	7	36
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										82	2	
FRL	39			32			55	67		68	7	30

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	35	47	40	37	60	62	49	72		97	67	40
SWD	23	36	32	26	57	54	36	49		92	26	
ELL	12	41	43	24	51	53	29	48		94	61	40
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39	47	40	36	60	63	53	76		98	67	
HSP	33	47	41	36	60	62	46	68		96	67	38
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	34	47	39	37	59	63	49	71		97	67	40

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	34	35	26	24	32	30	42	44		93	65	32
SWD	18	29	28	17	26	20	18	32		92	21	
ELL	15	30	24	17	30	28	31	33		89	52	32
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	31	16	24	31	27	42	51		98	70	
HSP	34	36	28	23	32	31	40	41		91	63	32
MUL	40											
PAC												
WHT	38	38		20	30							
FRL	33	34	25	22	30	28	42	42		94	64	31

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	35%	54%	-19%	50%	-15%
09	2023 - Spring	31%	51%	-20%	48%	-17%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	26%	56%	-30%	50%	-24%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	34%	52%	-18%	48%	-14%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	49%	65%	-16%	63%	-14%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	66%	-1%	63%	2%

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 lowest data component based on proficiency was the performance on the BEST Math EOC assessment. Due to an increase in enrollment of ELL students with DEUSS dates less than two years coupled with the fact that it was a baseline year for the BEST assessment, learning gains could not be used as an indicator of the students' performance.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was the performance on the 2023 FAST Reading assessment. The factor that contributed to this decline was the significant increase of ELL students enrolled during the school year with DEUSS dates less than 2 years. The data indicate that with these students included, the proficiency rate was 35%; however when the students were removed the overall proficiency level increased to 42%. The factor that contributed to this decline in the proficiency was the need for ELL students language acquisition and the time needed to acquire the content.

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 that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the performance on the ELA Reading data. The factor that contributed to this rift was the significant increase of ELL students enrolled during the school year with DEUSS dates less than 2 years. The data indicate that with these students included, the proficiency rate was 35%, however; when the students were removed the overall proficiency level increased to 42%. The factor that contributed to this decline in the proficiency was the need for ELL students language acquisition and the time needed to acquire the content.

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 Biology. The factor that contributed to this progress was teachers implementing ESOL strategies. The data indicates that 53% of our students demonstrated proficiency. The contributing factors were the effective implementation of common planning and a focus on Differentiated Instruction in conjunction with the incorporation of labs and hands on activities. These factors lead to a 5 % increase from the 2021-2022 school year.

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

After careful reflection of the EWS data from Part I, a potential area of concern is student attendance. The EWS data shows that 16% of our students had 31 or more absences and 30% of our students had between 16 to 30 absences. Students excessive absences hinders individual academic progress and morale, which negatively impacts school wide academic performance and culture.

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

The highest priority for school improvement in the upcoming school year is to increase the learning gains of the ELL student population in reading and mathematics.

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 2022-23 ELA FAST PM3 data, 42% of the 9th and 10th grade students were proficient. In 2021-22 the FSA data shows 35% of the 9th and 10th grade students were proficient, 47% of the 9th and 10th grade students had learning gains, and 40% of the 9th and 10th grade L25 students had learning gains. While there was an increase in the number of proficient students, some students have demonstrated a lack of comprehension of complex texts. Based on the data and contributing factor, we will strategically implement Differentiated Instruction to ensure targeted support and interventions are tailored to the specific needs of each student.

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 within ELA, we will show a 4% increase in learning gains and a 2% increase in L25 learning gains for 9th and 10th grade students by June 2024 as evidenced by the 2023-24 ELA Fast PM3 data compared to the 2022-2023 ELA FAST PM3 data.

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

The leadership team member(s) will participate in weekly common planning sessions to monitor progress and ensure that the teaching materials and assessment measures are effective, regardless of differences in student ability. The leadership team member(s) will also conduct administrative walkthroughs with the respective look-fors discussed during common planning to ensure fidelity and alignment to the the SIP. Additionally, data chats will be conducted to analyze and monitor student grouping and the effectiveness of student paths created and revised based on data to support the unique needs of each student. Lastly, the leadership team member(s) will monitor in real-time to build capacity during the Knowledge Swap teacher walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ursula Garbutt (190135@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.)

Within the Targeted Element of ELA, our school will focus on the evidenced-based intervention of Differentiated Instruction. Teachers will implement a framework for effective teaching that is conducive to different avenues to learn regardless of their differences and abilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The implementation of the evidence-based intervention of Differentiated Instruction will provide lessons and opportunities based on the students-varying abilities and varying learning modalities which enables students to understand grade-level content in a way they can learn.

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.

During the opening of school session, school teams will participate in a professional development session on how to build a data culture that fosters ownership and accountability among stakeholders by accessing and interpreting student data to make informed decisions for differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Dawn Pearce (dpearce@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 6

Differentiated instruction professional development will be conducted where stakeholders will be familiarized with the concept, vision, and expected outcomes of differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Ursula Garbutt (190135@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 6

Miami Learns will provide additional support for teachers in need of assistance implementing differentiated instruction through modeling, collaborative planning, and professional learning resources.

Person Responsible: Ursula Garbutt (190135@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 6

The action steps will be monitored by the leadership team through walkthroughs, data and data chats, and artifacts from common planning to ensure differentiated instruction is being implemented with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Stephen Papp (pr7011@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 29

Teachers and Leadership Team member(s) will meet weekly to utilize and analyze data to develop differentiated lesson plans and student groups based on the level of learners in their respective classes with varying abilities.

Person Responsible: Dawn Pearce (dpearce@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 5 - September 29

Teacher walkthroughs will begin where teachers will observe exemplar teacher models to ensure the intent of the evidence-based intervention of differentiated instruction is achieved with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Dawn Pearce (dpearce@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 18 - September 29

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

2022-23 B.E.S.T EOC assessments, 35% of the 9th and 10th grade students were proficient. In 2021-22 the FSA Math EOC data shows 37% of the 9th and 10th grade students were proficient, 60% of the 9th and 10th grade students had learning gains, and 62% of the 9th and 10th grade L25 students had learning gains. Based on the data and contributing factor that some students' math readiness levels negatively impact their ability to master grade-level tasks, we will implement the Targeted Element of Differentiated Instruction.

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 within Math, we will show a 1% increase in learning gains and a 1% increase in L25 learning gains for 9th and 10th grade students by June 2024 as evidenced by the 2023-24 B.E.S.T EOC assessments compared to the 2022-23 FSA Math EOC data.

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

The leadership team member(s) will participate in weekly common planning sessions to monitor progress and ensure that the teaching materials and assessment measures are effective, regardless of differences in student ability. The leadership team member(s) will also conduct administrative walkthroughs with the respective look-fors discussed during common planning to ensure fidelity and alignment to the the SIP. Additionally, data chats will be conducted to analyze and monitor student grouping and the effectiveness of student paths created and revised based on data to support the unique needs of each student. Lastly, the leadership team member(s) will monitor in real-time to build capacity during the Knowledge Swap teacher walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carita Facey (cfacey@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.)

Within the Targeted Element of Math, our school will focus on the evidenced-based intervention of differentiated instruction. Teachers will implement a framework for effective teaching that is conducive to different avenues to learn regardless of their differences and abilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The implementation of the evidence-based intervention of Differentiated Instruction will provide lessons and opportunities based on the students-varying abilities and varying learning modalities which enables students to understand grade-level content in a way they can learn.

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.

During the opening of school session, school teams will participate in a professional development session on how to build a data culture that fosters ownership and accountability among stakeholders by accessing and interpreting student data to make informed decisions for differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Ursula Garbutt (190135@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14-September 1

Differentiated instruction professional development will be conducted where stakeholders will be familiarized with the concept, vision, and expected outcomes of differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Carita Facey (cfacey@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14-September 1

Miami Learns will provide additional support for teachers in need of assistance implementing differentiated instruction through modeling, collaborative planning, and professional learning opportunities.

Person Responsible: Stephen Papp (pr7011@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14-September 1

The action steps will be monitored by the leadership team through walkthroughs, teacher and student data chats, and artifacts from common planning to ensure differentiated instruction is being implemented with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Stephen Papp (pr7011@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 29

Teachers and Leadership Team member(s) will meet weekly to utilize and analyze data to develop differentiated lesson plans and student groups based on the level of learners in their respective classes with varying abilities.

Person Responsible: Stephen Papp (pr7011@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 5 - September 29

Knowledge Swap teacher walkthroughs will begin where teachers will observe exemplar teacher models to ensure the intent of the evidence-based intervention of differentiated instruction is achieved with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Carita Facey (cfacey@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 18 - September 29

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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 F.A.S.T. PM3, 42% of the 9th and 10th grade students were proficient in ELA. Based on the 2022-2023 B.E.S.T Math assessments, 35% of the 9th and 10th grade students were proficient on the Algebra and Geometry EOCs. Based on the data and identified contributing factors of a high number of ELL students in levels 1 and 2, we will implement the Targeted Element of Differentiated Instruction.

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to increase the ELA proficiency in grades 9 and 10 at least 5 percentage points on the F.A.S.T. PM3 from 42% to 49% and to increase the Math proficiency math at least 1 percentage point on the B.E.S.T. Algebra and Geometry EOCs.

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

The leadership team member(s) will participate in weekly common planning sessions to monitor progress of the ELL subgroup and ensure that the teaching materials and assessment measures are effective, regardless of differences in student ability. The leadership team member(s) will also conduct administrative walkthroughs with the respective look-fors discussed during common planning to ensure fidelity and alignment to the SIP specific to ELL students. Additionally, data chats will be conducted to analyze and monitor student grouping and the effectiveness of student paths created and revised based on data to support the unique needs of each ELL student. Lastly, the leadership team member(s) will monitor in real- time to build capacity during the Knowledge Swap teacher walkthroughs with a focus on how the needs of ELL students are being addressed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ursula Garbutt (190135@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.)

Within the Targeted Element of English Language Learners, our school will focus on the evidenced- based intervention of differentiated instruction. Teachers will implement a framework for effective teaching that is conducive to different avenues to learn for ELL students regardless of their differences and abilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The implementation of the evidence-based intervention of Differentiated Instruction will provide lessons and opportunities based on the students-varying abilities, language acquisition needs, and varying learning modalities which enables ELL students to understand grade-level content in a way they can learn.

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.

During the opening of school session, school teams will learn how to build a data culture where stakeholders will take ownership by accessing and interpreting student data during a professional learning session.

Person Responsible: Stephen Papp (pr7011@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 29

Differentiated instruction professional development will be conducted where stakeholders will be familiarized with the concept, vision, and expected outcomes of differentiated instruction for ELL students.

Person Responsible: Ursula Garbutt (190135@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 29

Miami Learns will provide additional support for teachers in need of assistance implementing differentiated Instruction through modeling, collaborative planning, and professional learning resources for ELL students.

Person Responsible: Ursula Garbutt (190135@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 18 - October 27

Reading and Math coaches will collaborate on cross-curricular ELL strategies to share with their respective departments that are mutually beneficial to student achievement for varying abilities and readiness.

Person Responsible: Dawn Pearce (dpearce@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 18 - September 29

The action steps will be monitored by the leadership team through walkthroughs, data and data chats, and artifacts from common planning to ensure differentiated is being implemented with fidelity to benefit ELL students.

Person Responsible: Stephen Papp (pr7011@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 18 - October 27

Teachers and Leadership Team member(s) will meet weekly to utilize and analyze data on the ELL subgroup to develop differentiated lesson plans and student groups based on the academic and language level of learners in their respective classes with varying abilities.

Person Responsible: Dawn Pearce (dpearce@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 29

Knowledge Swap teacher walkthroughs will begin where teachers will observe exemplar teacher models to ensure the intent of the evidence-based intervention of differentiated instruction specifically for ELL students is achieved with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Ursula Garbutt (190135@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 1

#4. 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.

Based on qualitative data from the 2023 School Improvement Plan Survey, the "opportunity to be considered for leadership roles in my school" was identified as an area of growth. Teachers feel a greater sense of engagement and increased efficacy if they perceive their influence as high.

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

With the implementation of shared leadership, there will be at least a 3% increase on the 2024 School Improvement Plan Survey in the response area of "each year, all staff members have the opportunity to be considered for leadership roles at my school."

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

This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome on a semester basis and during Leadership Team meetings where teachers will have an opportunity to indicate their interest in shared leadership positions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephen Papp (pr7011@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 use of shared leadership would allow means for giving teachers, staff members, students, parents, and community members the opportunity to take on leadership roles or make decisions. This would allow for the differentiation of school governance and an alternative to traditional forms of school administration.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Specific teacher feedback was selected as a way to encourage opportunities between administration and teachers which will lead to shared leadership within the building. The criteria for selecting this strategy is based on the overall sentiment that teachers do not receive adequate leadership opportunities as evidenced by the results of the 2023 School Improvement Plan Survey.

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.

Create and share a survey for teachers to indicate their interest in shared leadership positions.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Munoz (smoonoz@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 18 - September 29

Create a survey for teachers to document their glows and grows in order to swap knowledge with other colleagues in the building.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Munoz (smoonoz@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 18 - September 29

Results will be readily accessible for staff to schedule a time to push into a classroom to observe fellow colleagues modeling a certain area of focus. This includes, but is not limited to differentiated instruction, classroom routines, technology integration, and ELL strategies.

Person Responsible: Rafael Gonzalez (ralph50@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 9 - October 20

Teachers will be encouraged to share out or "Big Up" another colleague at a faculty or department meeting about their knowledge swap experience.

Person Responsible: Ursula Garbutt (190135@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 9 - October 20

Create a school needs survey for teachers to express their opinion on the needs of the school to be shared with the District for additional support.

Person Responsible: Richard Browning (browning@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 23 - October 26

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be shared with stakeholders at PTSA, administration, faculty, department, and EESAC meetings as well as on the school website. This will be completed by uploading the SIP document on the school's website.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

During EESAC meetings and parent orientation the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to keep them well informed of their child's progress. Stakeholders will be informed through School Messenger, Schoology, Social Media Platforms, the School Marquee and the School Website.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

American Senior High School will provide extended learning opportunities by capitalizing on digital resources by maximizing the potential of Schoology. Additionally, by connecting with the community, students will receive real-world applications that are relevant and meaningful through career readiness programs and industry certifications.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

We offer a variety of career and technical education courses for the students that will allow them to be industry certified and have an opportunity to advance in their postsecondary goals. These resources are extended to the community as well through adult education.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No