Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Mast Academy School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Mast Academy

3979 RICKENBACKER CSWY, Key Biscayne, FL 33149

http://mast.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.

Maritime and Science Technology Academy focuses on diversity, environmental awareness, and technology. Our school incorporates a thematic and inquiry-based approach, problem-solving, and experiential learning to provide students with opportunities for life-long learning which impacts the global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Utilizing innovation to educate global citizens.

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
Gould, Michael	Assistant Principal	Assists the Principal in overseeing the academic and operational functions of the institution.
Torossian, Mariam	Assistant Principal	Assists the Principal in overseeing the academic and operational functions of the institution.
Semeraro, Giuseppe	Assistant Principal	Assists the Principal in overseeing the academic and operational functions of the institution.
Galeri, Katerina	Other	Assists the School Leadership Team with the development and implementation of a schoolwide Testing Program.
Fernandez, Jennifer	Other	Assists the School Leadership Team with the coordination and implementation of a schoolwide Activities Program.
Couzo, Carlos	Other	Assists the School Leadership Team with the coordination and implementation of the School's Athletic Program.
Fernandez, Melissa	Other	Assists the School Leadership Team with recruiting and development of the overall academic program.
Collman, Cadian	Principal	Oversees the academic and operational functions of the institution.

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.

MAST Academy identified all relevant stakeholders, including the school leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents, and students in identifying areas that need improvement based on data and assessment. We then developed a clear strategy for engaging each stakeholder group which involved surveys, focus groups, and meetings. The purpose, goals, and timeline of the SIP development process were clearly communicated to all stakeholders and a clear understanding of how their input will contribute to improving the school was ascertained. Input from stakeholders was gathered through various methods, such as surveys, meetings, or online platforms, posing questions related to school challenges, strengths, goals, and areas for improvement. The collected data was then analyzed to identify common themes, priorities, and concerns raised by different stakeholder groups. With the insights gained from stakeholder input, we worked on drafting the initial School Improvement Plan while ensuring that the plan addresses the identified priorities and aligns with the school's mission and vision. The draft plan was shared with stakeholders to seek their feedback and necessary revisions were made based on the feedback received. Once the revisions were incorporated, we finalized the School Improvement Plan while ensuring that it included specific actions, measurable objectives, timelines, and responsible parties. Finally, the plan was shared with all stakeholders with clear communication as to how their input influenced the plan and how their ongoing involvement will be crucial for successful implementation.

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))

There will be regular monitoring for the progress of the SIP's implementation and the involvement of all stakeholders in tracking the outcomes of the goals and action steps. Adjustments to the plan as needed based on student's progress monitoring data, ongoing feedback, and changing circumstances will also be adopted. All stakeholders will be involved throughout the process. Their insights, concerns, expertise, and suggestions will be integrated to ensure continuous improvement and closing of the achievement gap.

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	77%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	21%
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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	5	16
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	4	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	3	17
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	14	21	48

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	1	0	0	1

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	10	4	6	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	19
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	13
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	23	48

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	1	0	0	2

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) 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	10	4	6	20
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	7
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	23	33

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*	87	55	50	91	54	51	88		
ELA Learning Gains				73			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				73			67		
Math Achievement*	90	43	38	91	42	38	83		
Math Learning Gains				84			51		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				81			54		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	93	62	64	93	41	40	90		
Social Studies Achievement*	90	69	66	96	56	48	92		
Middle School Acceleration	96			99	56	44	78		
Graduation Rate	100	89	89	100	56	61	98		
College and Career Acceleration	100	70	65	100	67	67	100		
ELP Progress	88	49	45	100			89		

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	93
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	744
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	90
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	1081
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	100

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	60			
ELL	86			
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	84			
HSP	92			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	96			
FRL	88			

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	77			
ELL	81			
AMI				
ASN	100			
BLK	81			
HSP	89			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	91			
FRL	88			

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	87			90			93	90	96	100	100	88
SWD	56			64							2	
ELL	70			81			72	81	95	100	8	88
AMI												
ASN	92										1	
BLK	61			73						100	4	
HSP	87			90			92	88	96	100	8	86
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	88			92			96	97	97	100	7	
FRL	83			81			90	75		100	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	91	73	73	91	84	81	93	96	99	100	100	100
SWD	78	59		77	92							
ELL	70	62	61	85	80	79	83	91	94			100
AMI												
ASN	100											
BLK	92	69										
HSP	91	72	72	90	83	80	92	96	99	100	100	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	92	74	79	93	85	89	94	95	100	100	100	
FRL	91	73	72	85	82	82	85	94	100	100	100	

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	88	65	67	83	51	54	90	92	78	98	100	89
SWD	47	33		60	30							
ELL	73	65	65	73	48	47	85	83	80	86	100	89

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	93	77										
BLK	89	58		80	20							
HSP	87	63	65	83	51	52	90	93	78	97	99	93
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	91	71	75	84	54	60	91	88	76	98	100	
FRL	84	59	56	77	40	46	89	94	67	97	100	

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	88%	54%	34%	50%	38%
07	2023 - Spring	86%	50%	36%	47%	39%
08	2023 - Spring	88%	51%	37%	47%	41%
09	2023 - Spring	92%	51%	41%	48%	44%
06	2023 - Spring	85%	50%	35%	47%	38%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	88%	58%	30%	54%	34%
08	2023 - Spring	94%	59%	35%	55%	39%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	87%	40%	47%	44%	43%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	56%	41%	50%	47%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	52%	41%	48%	45%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	65%	33%	63%	35%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	68%	29%	66%	31%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	66%	34%	63%	37%

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 2023 data results showed MAST Academy outperforming the District and State in terms of proficiency. In the area of ELA, 88% of the students were proficient. This is five percentage points less than the established 2023 ELA Proficiency goal. Although Learning Gains were not calculated due to the FAST Assessment's Baseline Administration year, further analysis of the data shows a need for improvement in the L25 ELA.

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

The 2023 data results showed the greatest decline in the area of ELA, from 93% to 88%, a change of five percentage points from the established 2023 ELA Proficiency goal. Unfamiliarity with the nuances of the new B.E.S.T standards and possible inconsistent implementation of differentiated instruction contributed to this decline.

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 2023 data results showed MAST Academy outperforming the State in terms of proficiency across all accountability areas. The greatest gap was seen in the area of ELA. MAST Academy's proficiency rate was 37 percentage points higher than the State average (MAST Academy's proficiency was 88% and the State Average was 51%). The contributing factors were teacher quality along with early implementation of interventions and extended learning opportunities.

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

The 2023 data when comparing FAST PM1 to FAST PM3 shows a 15 percentage points increase in Math proficiency. New actions that were enlisted included an earlier start to interventions, and more focus on data utilization to plan for teaching and learning.

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

The area of concern lies within English Language Arts, given we have three percent of students performing one or more grade levels below their current grade in ELA.

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. ELA Learning Gains
3. ELA LG L25
4. Math Learning Gains
5. Math LG L25

Support ELA/Reading teachers with an intense focus on pedagogical practices including but not limited to lesson planning, data analysis, differentiation of instruction, collaborative learning structures, and student engagement strategies.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

According to the 2023 F.A.S.T data, 88 percent of our students are proficient in ELA. Based on the 2023 established school accountability goal there was a five - percentage points gap between the actual and projected goal of 93 percent. As such, we will implement the targeted element ELA.

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

If we successfully implement the targeted element of ELA during the 2023-2024 school year, student proficiency will increase by five percentage points in ELA.

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

The leadership will conduct quarterly data chats following i-Ready, and FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments. Weekly walkthroughs with teacher feedback will be conducted to observe the use of reading strategies including, but not limited to, peer discussions, Reciprocal Teaching, predicting, clarifying, question generating, summarizing, Independent Reading, CRISS Strategies, and student-led discussions/Harkness Method.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Gould (gouldm@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 evidence-based intervention that will be implemented is Reciprocal Teaching / Peer Learning.

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

Reciprocal Teaching is a process developed by Palincsar & Brown (1984) where the role of "educator" is slowly passed from teacher to student, as students lead peer discussions and practice using four critical reading strategies: Predicting, Clarifying, Question Generating, and Summarizing. Reciprocal Teaching is also known as Peer Learning. Peer Learning is a technique, in which students develop strong oral language skills as they work together to improve their reading comprehension. The purpose of this technique is 1) To encourage students to think about what they are reading and their thought process. 2) To allow students to collaborate with each other to gain a better understanding of a text. 3) To teach students to be actively involved in monitoring their comprehension. 4) To teach students to ask questions during reading.

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.

Step 1: By September 29, 2023, all ELA teachers will be provided resources to support the implementation of reciprocal teaching/peer learning in ELA.

Person Responsible: Michael Gould (gouldm@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

Step 2: By September 25, 2023, PowerBi will be used to provide each ELA teacher with the disaggregated list of students' ELA data and other relevant student information to be used by the teachers to identify areas in need of improvement and tailor instruction to meet the specific needs of each learner.

Person Responsible: Katerina Galeri (katgaleri@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 25, 2023

Step 3: By September 28, 2023, guidelines and prompts to guide student-led discussions will be provided to all ELA teachers.

Person Responsible: Stella Crespo (screspo@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 28, 2023

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

Equity and the reduction of minority group isolation were chosen based on anecdotal evidence and collaboration with students and staff in focus groups. When students feel included and have a sense of belonging, they are more likely to exercise their student voice. Based on the School Climate Survey administered at the end of 2023, 42 percent of student respondents indicated that "My teachers make learning fun and interesting". This represents a two percentage point decrease when compared to the results of the 2022 (44 percent) School Climate Survey responses to the same question.

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

If we successfully implement our targeted element of Student Voice, our 2023-2024 School Climate Survey will show an increase of at least ten percentage points for the question, "My teachers make learning fun and interesting".

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

To ensure we are on track to achieving the desired outcome, the Leadership Team and students will meet to review and discuss student perceptions and experiences regarding equity and the reduction of minority group isolation in the school by way of survey results and focus groups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Gould (gouldm@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 Student Voice, our school will focus on equity and the reduction of minority group isolation. This will assist in ensuring all students and staff feel a sense of belonging and a relevant part of our community.

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

Student Voice shows students that their expertise, opinions, and ideas are valued in the school. This can impact their value of school and sense of belonging. There is a wide variety of ways Student Voice can be implemented including, but not limited to, student focus groups, Student Government Association, student surveys, and/or a visible and utilized suggestion box. The most important elements of including Student Voice are ensuring there are equitable opportunities for all students to provide input and that there is feedback to students on how their input has been considered and/or incorporated.

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.

Step 1: By September 7, 2023, the Leadership Team will work to connect with and mentor students who are experiencing feelings of isolation or lacking a sense of belonging which has resulted in disengagement. Students will be identified based on their responses to the "School Community" Survey.

Person Responsible: Cadian Collman (collman@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 7, 2023

Step 2: By September 28, 2023, the Leadership Team will collaborate with students to plan activities that foster collegiality, and a sense of belonging and collaboration among students, providing students with a forum to express their individuality and interests.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Fernandez (jenniferfernandez@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 28, 2023

Step 3: By September 29, 2023, The Leadership Team and the Student Government Association will work with EESAC to come up with incentives that will be implemented to celebrate student success.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Fernandez (jenniferfernandez@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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

According to the 2023 F.A.S.T data, 88 percent of our middle students are proficient in ELA. Based on the 2023 established school accountability goal there was a five percentage points gap between the actual and projected goal of 93 percent. In the area of mathematics, 93 percent of our students are proficient; however, in analyzing the percentage of students performing below grade level, we find it necessary to implement the targeted element of differentiation.

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

If we successfully implement the targeted element of Differentiation during the 2023-2024 school year, the percentage of students reading one or more years below grade level will demonstrate 14 percentage points growth in ELA from FAST PM 1 to FAST PM 3. In the area of mathematics, students performing one or more years below grade level will demonstrate 22 percentage points growth in Mathematics from FAST PM 1 to FAST PM 3.

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

During classroom walkthroughs, student work products will be reviewed to see evidence of differentiation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Gould (gouldm@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 evidence-based intervention that will be implemented is Differentiated Instruction (DI).

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

Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of: acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability. Research demonstrates this method benefits a wide range of students.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Step 1: Beginning September 11, 2023, through September 22, 2023, grades 6-10 MATH and Reading teachers will administer the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) MATH and Reading PM1 to

gauge students' prior knowledge, learning styles, and strengths. Data obtained from this assessment will be used to plan for differentiated instruction and to identify specific strategies to be used with each group.

Person Responsible: Michael Gould (gouldm@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 22, 2023

Step 2: By September 27, 2023, the school leadership team will conduct data chats with ELA and MATH teachers to discuss student performance data and collaboratively develop a wide variety of instructional resources that cater to different learning preferences and levels.

Person Responsible: Michael Gould (gouldm@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 27, 2023

Step 3: By September 29, 2023, walkthroughs will be conducted on an ongoing basis to monitor the implementation of differentiated learning activities. Feedback will be provided to teachers.

Person Responsible: Michael Gould (gouldm@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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 the 2022 -2023 school climate survey, 47 percent of students stated that their teachers make them want to learn. This represents a two percentage point decrease when compared to 2021-2022 (45 percent). The 2022-2023 data showed that 42 percent of students stated their teachers make learning fun and interesting. This represents a three percentage point decrease when compared to 2021-2022 (39 percent). Selecting Student Engagement as a goal is based on its potential to yield positive academic, social, and emotional outcomes for students, improve the overall school environment, and align with broader educational objectives. It represents a comprehensive approach to enhancing the educational experience for all students.

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

If we successfully implement student engagement, then we will see an increase of at least 10 percentage points as evidenced by the 2023-2024 Student School Climate Survey responses to the statements, " My teachers make me want to learn" and "My teachers make learning fun and interesting".

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

During walkthroughs, the administrative team will pay close attention to students actively engaged in the learning process as evidenced by participation in learning activities that require and promote critical thinking. Additionally, the types and levels of questions posed by the teacher to check for understanding and engage the learners will be observed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Gould (gouldm@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 evidence-based intervention that will be implemented is Effective Questioning/Response Techniques.

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

Effective Questioning and Response Techniques are an important part of classroom instruction which is used to develop higher-order thinking skills, promote critical thinking, and/or gauge whether students understand what is being taught (formative assessment).

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.

Step 1: By September 28, 2023, the faculty will be presented with a variety of student engagement strategies related to effective questioning and response techniques.

Person Responsible: Michael Gould (gouldm@dadeschools.net)

By When: By September 28, 2023

Step 2: From September 19, 2023, departments will share research-based best practices related to developing higher-order questions and student engagement strategies that foster students' curiosity, and creativity during monthly Faculty Meetings.

Person Responsible: Michael Gould (gouldm@dadeschools.net)

By When: By September 19, 2023

Step 3: From September 19, 2023, spotlight teachers for their use of effective student engagement strategies and questioning techniques. For example, teachers afford learners the opportunity to actively reflect on their learning and make connections to previous knowledge or experiences; integrating technology tools at the modification or redefinition levels; students engaged in learning tasks that include analyzing, creating, evaluating, and or problem-solving.

Person Responsible: Cadian Collman-Perez (pr7161@dadeschools.net)

By When: By September 19, 2023