# Alonzo & Tracy Mourning Senior High School



**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

# Table of Contents

# Alonzo & Tracy Mourning Senior High School

## 2601 NE 151ST ST, Miami, FL 33160

## http://atmourning.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.

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

### Provide the school's vision statement.

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

## School Leadership Team, 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Shinn, Christopher | Principal | |
| Homma, Adalys | Assistant Principal | Oversee the daily functions of the school and ensure that students are receiving a quality education in a safe environment. |
| Medina, Eddie | Assistant Principal | Oversee the daily functions of the school and ensure that students are receiving a quality education in a safe environment. |
| Sakowicz, Gussie | Assistant Principal | Oversee the daily functions of the school and ensure that students are receiving a quality education in a safe environment. |
| Baldizon, Steven | Administrative Support | - Activities/ Clubs<br>- PD Liaison |
| Berkson, Lisa | Administrative Support | - Testing Schedule<br>- Test Security<br>- Testing Material<br>- Bell Schedule<br>- Graduation Tracker<br>- School Data<br>- MINT Coordinator |
| Lambert, Victor | Teacher, K-12 | - Digital Innovator<br>- Math Chair<br>- Advanced Placement Teacher |
| Szeto, Lisette | Teacher, ESE | -Support Facilitation<br>-PLST Instructional Coach |

**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.

School stakeholders are involved in developing the School Improvement Plan at various stages. Initially, the administration, leadership team, and the Professional Learning Support Team analyzed various sources of data, state exams, the 2022-2023 School Climate Survey, trends in attendance, advance academic data, Early Warning Signs, and other pertinent data related to school accountability performance. Specific areas of concern were identified over the summer which would comprise the focus for improvement for the next school year. Later, shared with the school's curriculum council to determine

whether there were any other areas of concern. From the feedback, a rough draft of the SIP was developed to include measurable outcomes, interventions, and action steps. The rough draft was presented to the faculty and feedback was encouraged from them. Finally, the rough draft was presented to the EESAC committee to be reviewed by the various members which include, parents, business partners, students, and teachers. With each set of stakeholders, opportunity was given for feedback, place any concerns related to targets, and make suggestions that could benefit the focus and implementation of action steps for each target.

**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))

At Alonzo and Tracy Mourning Senior High School, we want to ensure that our SIP is not a static document, but rather a living strategy that adapts to the evolving needs of our students and the community. Through a collaborative effort, the school will regularly assess whether the selected research-based strategies are contributing to sustainable improvements or if further adjustments are needed in order to close achievement gaps and ensure that all students meet the State's academic standards. Additionally, quarterly EESAC meetings are scheduled to gain further insight to ensure all stakeholders are involved and adjustments to the SIP are as needed.

| 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** | 75% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 69% |
| **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) Asian Students (ASN) 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: B 2019-20: B |

| | |
|---|---|
| | 2018-19: B |
| | 2017-18: B |
| **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 | |

**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 | 311 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 254 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 212 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 275 |
| 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 | 313 |

**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 | 375 |

**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 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

### 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 | 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 | |

## 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* | 55 | 55 | 50 | 54 | 54 | 51 | 52 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 56 | | | 48 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 48 | | | 42 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 44 | 43 | 38 | 40 | 42 | 38 | 38 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 50 | | | 34 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 47 | | | 33 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 81 | 62 | 64 | 47 | 41 | 40 | 54 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 71 | 69 | 66 | 67 | 56 | 48 | 66 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 56 | 44 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | 92 | 89 | 89 | 95 | 56 | 61 | 95 | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | 42 | 70 | 65 | 52 | 67 | 67 | 60 | | |
| ELP Progress | 55 | 49 | 45 | 45 | | | 58 | | |

*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 | 63 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 440 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 97 |
| Graduation Rate | 92 |

| 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 | 601 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 97 |
| Graduation Rate | 95 |

## 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 | 52 | | | |
| ELL | 54 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 60 | | | |
| BLK | 55 | | | |
| HSP | 62 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | | | |

| **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 | 60 | | | |

| **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 | 42 | | | |
| ELL | 45 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 73 | | | |
| BLK | 53 | | | |
| HSP | 53 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | | | |
| FRL | 52 | | | |

**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 | 55 | | | 44 | | | 81 | 71 | | 92 | 42 | 55 |
| SWD | 32 | | | 29 | | | 80 | 68 | | 11 | 6 | |
| ELL | 30 | | | 38 | | | 83 | 52 | | 42 | 7 | 55 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 60 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| BLK | 45 | | | 33 | | | 70 | 53 | | 32 | 7 | 55 |
| HSP | 50 | | | 43 | | | 85 | 70 | | 40 | 7 | 55 |
| 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 | 72 | | | 63 | | | 82 | 85 | | 52 | 7 | 58 |
| FRL | 53 | | | 38 | | | 77 | 66 | | 38 | 7 | 55 |

| 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 | 54 | 56 | 48 | 40 | 50 | 47 | 47 | 67 | | 95 | 52 | 45 |
| SWD | 32 | 48 | 50 | 30 | 44 | 50 | 22 | 42 | | 92 | 13 | |
| ELL | 29 | 48 | 44 | 34 | 45 | 39 | 37 | 41 | | 94 | 38 | 45 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 64 | 82 | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | 52 | 49 | 33 | 54 | 54 | 37 | 74 | | 100 | 37 | |
| HSP | 52 | 54 | 46 | 39 | 49 | 43 | 46 | 62 | | 96 | 51 | 43 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | 63 | 50 | 48 | 45 | 50 | 56 | 75 | | 91 | 60 | 56 |
| FRL | 49 | 53 | 47 | 37 | 50 | 46 | 42 | 63 | | 96 | 47 | 46 |

| 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 | 52 | 48 | 42 | 38 | 34 | 33 | 54 | 66 | | 95 | 60 | 58 |
| SWD | 32 | 39 | 32 | 40 | 46 | 43 | 50 | 46 | | 84 | 27 | |
| ELL | 19 | 40 | 42 | 29 | 36 | 35 | 32 | 52 | | 92 | 61 | 58 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 45 | 40 | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | 37 | 39 | 29 | 32 | 30 | 55 | 64 | | 100 | 42 | |
| HSP | 48 | 46 | 41 | 35 | 35 | 34 | 53 | 60 | | 93 | 65 | 59 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 66 | 56 | 57 | 50 | 31 | | 56 | 81 | | 95 | 62 | 55 |
| FRL | 47 | 45 | 41 | 32 | 32 | 34 | 53 | 62 | | 95 | 58 | 51 |

**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 | 49% | 54% | -5% | 50% | -1% |
| 09 | 2023 - Spring | 49% | 51% | -2% | 48% | 1% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 33% | 56% | -23% | 50% | -17% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 47% | 52% | -5% | 48% | -1% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 82% | 65% | 17% | 63% | 19% |

| 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 data component that showed the lowest performance is the "College and Career Acceleration," with a performance rate of 42%. Some contributing factors to this low performance is the continuous teacher turnover in the school's Cyber Security Academy and other unforeseen issues with being able to administer ICE exam in the various programs. Additionally, the school's three-year trend regarding advanced placement student enrollment dropped 38% after the return from hybrid learning. These factor had a significant impact on the students' ability to receive consistent and high-quality instruction, which in turn affects their performance in the College and Career Acceleration component.

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

College and Career Acceleration continues to decline as shown by the school's five-year trend. The data showed a 10-point decrease from the 2021-2022 school year from 53% to 43% respectively. One contributing factor to this trend includes continuous teacher turnover. This causes the new teacher to be unfamiliar with the course pedagogy and industry certification examination. Additionally, when a teacher was hired mid-year, professional development regarding the course was not offered. Lastly, the school's three-year trend regarding advanced placement student enrollment dropped 38% after the return from hybrid learning.

**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.**

Algebra 1 had the most evident gap compared to the state average by 13 percentage points for students scoring level 3 or above. Even though our Algebra 1 demonstrated improvement from the previous year's loss, our school still fell short of the state average due to our entire Algebra 1 team being first-year teachers.

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

Biology surpassed the school goal (58%) by 25% points. We implemented a new strategy through the district science department where our lower 10th-grade students were placed in Environmental Science to provide additional support in reading and science comprehension to prepare them for the Biology EOC. We are tracking these students and will receive targeted guidance in preparation for the 2024 Biology EOC.

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

Based on the provided information about the Early Warning Indicators, the fact that attendance and discipline are identified as leading factors in student performance raises concerns about the overall student achievement and behavior of students. Twenty-five percent of students exhibited attendance below 90% and 11% of students received one or more suspensions. Twenty-five percent of students exhibited attendance below 90%. Eleven percent of students received one or more suspensions.

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

Our school's highest priorities include increasing our college and career-ready acceleration, increasing new teacher support, and revising the school's discipline policies.

**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 Career & Technical Education

### 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 acceleration data, 43% of our 2021-2022 senior cohort met the college and career requirement compared to the district average of 70%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of the new teacher turnover, the school will implement Job-Embedded Professional Development.

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

With the implementation of Job-Embedded Professional Development, our acceleration data will increase 10 percentage points to 53% by June 7, 2023.

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

Monitoring the desired outcome of CTE Job-Embedded Professional Development involves a comprehensive and ongoing process that integrates assessment, feedback, data analysis, and reflection to ensure that educators are effectively improving their instructional practices and enhancing student learning within the context of Career and Technical Education. Peer monitoring, support from the district CTE department, as well as administrative walkthroughs will be utilized to assist in monitoring the progress of CTE programs and the teachers teaching them.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gussie Sakowicz (gussie@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.)

Job-Embedded Professional Development (JEPD) refers to teacher learning that is grounded in day-to-day teaching practice and is designed to enhance teachers' content-specific instructional practices with the intent of improving student learning. It is primarily school or classroom based and is integrated into the workday, consisting of teachers assessing and finding solutions for authentic and immediate problems of practice as part of a cycle of continuous improvement.

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

The rationale for selecting a Job-Embedded Professional Development strategy is rooted in its ability to provide relevant, contextualized, and sustained learning experiences for teachers that directly impact instructional practices and student learning outcomes. This approach recognizes the importance of connecting professional development to the daily realities of teaching, fostering continuous improvement, and promoting collaboration among educators.

### 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.

On August 15, CTE teachers will attend the district's CTE Opening of Schools Professional Development. By having the CTE teachers attend this professional development, then teachers will be made aware of the instructional implications and frameworks for each course.

**Person Responsible:** Gussie Sakowicz (gussie@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** August 15, 2023

Administration will meet with the department monthly to brief and review the current instructional framework to develop a school-wide timelines. Additionally, the school will establish support from the district's CTE office.

**Person Responsible:** Gussie Sakowicz (gussie@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** August 14, 2023 - September 29, 2023

Teacher will work with administration and testing chair to develop a calendar for administering exams. The calendar will include, but not limited to preparation, review, exam administration, remediation, and re-testing.

**Person Responsible:** Gussie Sakowicz (gussie@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** August 14, 2023 - September 29, 2023

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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 school-wide component data, 46% of teachers feel overloaded and overwhelmed by working at the school from the staff school climate survey. Based on the data and identified contributing factor of teacher pedagogy, we will implement the targeted element of instructional coaching.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 academic year, the school aims to decrease the percentage of teachers who feel overloaded and overwhelmed by working at the school from 54% to 30%, through the implementation of targeted instructional coaching.

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

Monitoring instructional coaching for the desired outcomes involves a systematic approach that ensures coaching is effective, aligns with goals, and leads to improved teaching practices and student learning. Focus will be placed on creating a coaching calendar to address teachers with 3 or less years of experience.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Eddie Medina (emedina@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.)

Instructional Support/Coaching is when teachers work together to set a measurable goal to improve instructional outcomes. Coaching Cycles focus on the identified goal and increases the achievement and engagement of every student by bringing out the best performance of every teacher. Coaches use both student-centered and teacher-centered methods to help teachers improve the decisions they make about their instruction.

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

Instructional coaching is chosen as the specific evidence-based intervention due to its focus on collaborative improvement, personalized development, data-driven decision-making, and sustained growth. By working closely with teacher leaders, teachers can refine their instructional practices, enhance student learning experiences, and contribute to the overall improvement of the educational environment, which will help decrease our teachers feeling overwhelmed.

**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.

Administration will meet with Curriculum Council to discuss academic focuses and establish departmental instructional teacher leaders within each department.

**Person Responsible:** Eddie Medina (emedina@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** August 14, 2023 - September 29, 2023

The PLST will present research-based strategies at the non-op professional development to inform faculty members about the district's instructional coaching initiative during the morning session.

**Person Responsible:** Lisette Szeto (lszeto@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** August 15, 2023

Regular administrative walkthroughs will take place with immediate feedback to address progress in targeted areas. Administration will work with instructional coaches to identify the targeted areas.

**Person Responsible:** Eddie Medina (emedina@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** September 29, 2023

## #3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

**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 school climate data, 48% of faculty disagree that adequate disciplinary measures are used effectively for disruptive behavior. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of lack of administrative follow-through, lack of consistent policies, and awareness of procedures, we will implement the targeted element of response to Early Warning Systems.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 academic year, the percentage of faculty who disagree that adequate disciplinary measures are used effectively for disruptive behavior will decrease from 48% (as per the 2022-2023 school climate data) to 35%.

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

The monitoring of the Early Warning Systems for improving disruptive behavior will involve collaborating with educators to identify specific early warning indicators that could signal potential disruptive behavior. Administration will support staff, in conjunction with support personnel, to review policies and procedures relevant and adjust as accordantly.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Christopher Shinn (cshinn@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.)

Response to Early Warning Systems (EWS) involves establishing a system based on student data to identify students who exhibit behavior or academic performance that puts them at risk of dropping out of school. Response to EWS utilizes predictive data, identifies off-track or at-risk students, targets interventions, and reveals patterns and root causes.

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

The rationale for selecting Early Warning Systems for identifying and supporting at-risk students is rooted in the desire to provide timely assistance, prevent dropout, optimize resources, and ultimately foster a positive learning environment that sets students on a path to 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.

Administration will review existing school policies with the school leadership team and key stakeholders to establish revised procedures for SCSI.

**Person Responsible:** Adalys Homma (homma1@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** August 14, 2023 - September 29, 2023

During the non-op PD day, faculty and staff will be presented with the school's revised procedures for SCSI to gather feedback, comments, and concerns before it is finalized and announced during grade-level orientation meetings.

**Person Responsible:** Adalys Homma (homma1@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** August 14, 2023 - August 25, 2023

The leadership will do a comprehensive review of discipline and attendance data to determine the effectiveness of policies and make adjustments where needed.

**Person Responsible:** Adalys Homma (homma1@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** October 26, 2023

## #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.

According to the 2022-2023 school climate survey, 83% of new and early career teacher (5 out of 6 teachers) did not participate in NEST (New Educator Support and Training) sessions. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of teacher certification, new teachers to the profession, and lack of time for support, the school will implement Mentorship Programs.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, the participation rate of new and early career teachers in NEST sessions will increase from 17% to 60%, as measured by the 2023-2024 school climate survey.

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

Monitoring teacher mentorships involves a combination of regular communication check-ins, data collection, peer-to-peer observations, and continuous improvement efforts to create a successful and impactful mentorship program.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lisa Berkson (lberkson@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.)

Mentorship Programs refers to the implementation and maintenance of mentoring programs which may include: teacher to teacher, student to student, and teacher/staff to student. Effective Mentorship Programs include regularly scheduled meetings between the mentor and mentee(s) with a purposeful conversation that has set objectives. Mentorship can help develop students' social emotional competencies, create a sense of belonging, and increase valuing of school.

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

The rationale for selecting a Mentorship Programs strategy is to create a dynamic learning environment that benefits both mentors and mentees, fosters professional growth, and contributes to the overall success of individuals and the organization as a whole.

**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.

The school will identify the PLST Lead Mentor and will meet with administration to ensure every identified new teacher is paired with a mentor or a buddy teacher.

**Person Responsible:** Lisa Berkson (lberkson@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** August 14, 2023 - September 29, 2023

The PLST Lead Mentor will ensure each new mentor and buddy teacher is trained to be certified as a MINT mentor.

**Person Responsible:** Lisa Berkson (lberkson@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** August 14, 2023 - September 29, 2023

The PLST Leader Mentor will create a new teacher PLC calendar/ plan, in conjunction with the PLST team and school leadership, to ensure dates do not overlap with the school's testing and activities calendar.

**Person Responsible:** Lisa Berkson (lberkson@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** August 14, 2023 - September 29, 2023

The administration and the PLST Lead Mentor will survey teachers to make sure resources are adequate and available for new teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Eddie Medina (emedina@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** September 12, 2023

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

## 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: Career & Technical Education | $0.00 |
|---|--------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning | $0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | $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.**

Yes