Medical Academy For Science And Technology (MAST) @ Homestead

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Medical Academy For Science And Technology (M.A.S.T.) @ Homestead

1220 NW 1ST AVE, Homestead, FL 33030

http://mastmedical.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.

MAST @ Homestead is a high school that pledges to provide higher education in the medical health sciences through a challenging curriculum that offers its students higher critical thinking in the areas of engineering, technology, mathematics, science, field studies, projects, competitions, and scientific research. MAST @ Homestead is committed to challenging students to become leaders in the medical field that are dedicated to public service, socially responsible, and facilitators in providing the health care needs to our ever-changing global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

MAST @ Homestead pledges to provide a medical health science high school academy recognized by its formation of students seeking careers in health care and science research through a challenging curriculum that exposes them to critical thinking, engineering, technology, mathematics, science, field studies, projects, competitions, and scientific research. MAST @ Homestead is committed to forge individuals to become leaders in the medical field, dedicate to public service, social responsibility, and facilitate the health care needs to our ever-changing global community.

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
Baril, Rachelle	Principal	School Principal.
Cadaval, David	Assistant Principal	School Assistant Principal, Instructional Leader, oversees all facets of operations.
Velazquez, Anthony	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Velazquez is a member of the SIP team and an ELA teacher.

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.

During this year's SYNERGY conference the leadership team decided to focus on English Language Arts, Geometry, Strengthening Positive School Climate, and increasing Advanced Placement scores in AP Statistics as the major foci the School Improvement Plan. This decision was reached through an analysis of the performance data for the 2022-2023 school year and will be shared with the stakeholders

to include parents, students, and business community leaders through the Educational Excellence School Advisory Committee and with the faculty specifically during opening of school sessions.

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

The SIP will be regularly monitored through classrooms walkthroughs, student progress monitoring, staff feedback, and parental/community input. As progress monitoring data is collected after each assessment, the leadership will review and reflect on the students' performance and then immediately meet with specific students needing the most support. During the multiple scheduled EESAC meetings, these data will also be shared with stakeholders to include students, parents, and community / business leaders. When students are found to not be performing on level as based on norm referencing, the parents of these students will be encouraged to have the students participate in extended learning opportunities scheduled for after school.

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	91%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	78%
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)	English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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*	88	55	50	92	54	51	87		
ELA Learning Gains				78			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				82			68		
Math Achievement*	83	43	38	74	42	38	74		
Math Learning Gains				73			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69			62		
Science Achievement*	93	62	64	86	41	40	94		
Social Studies Achievement*	94	69	66	91	56	48	95		
Middle School Acceleration					56	44			
Graduation Rate	100	89	89	100	56	61	100		
College and Career Acceleration	97	70	65	99	67	67	97		
ELP Progress		49	45						

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

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	93
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	555

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	84
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	844
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	100

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	64			
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	94			
HSP	91			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	99			
FRL	89			

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				
ELL	74			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	91			
HSP	83			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	92			
FRL	83			

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	88			83			93	94		100	97	
SWD	64										1	
ELL	52			77			82				3	
AMI												
ASN	90										1	
BLK	88			100			100	89		88	6	
HSP	86			77			90	94		98	6	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	97							100		100	4	
FRL	83			74			89	92		96	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	92	78	82	74	73	69	86	91		100	99	
SWD												
ELL	68	76	77									
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	87	68						100		100	100	
HSP	92	79	82	72	72	62	84	89		100	100	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	94	79		87	85		100	95		100	95	
FRL	91	78	81	71	73	60	82	89		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	87	62	68	74	42	62	94	95		100	97	
SWD												
ELL	66	50	55	80	50		94					
AMI												
ASN	100	92								100	100	
BLK	80	58	73	63	27		82	94		100	97	
HSP	88	61	68	75	43	60	95	96		100	96	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	87	63						100		100	100	
FRL	86	61	67	74	46	73	93	94		100	98	

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%
09	2023 - Spring	86%	51%	35%	48%	38%

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

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	52%	34%	48%	38%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	65%	27%	63%	29%

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

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The 2023 PM3 results demonstrated that the percentage of students scoring at proficiency in ELA decreased from 92% to 87%. The noted learning curve of the new assessed standards using a new testing platform by the students negatively impacted the results. A need to strengthen the teachers' mastery of the new platform reporting tool is also noted as a factor to the 2023 results.

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

The ELA PM3 results showed the greatest decline demonstrated by a decrease of 5 percentage points from 92% proficiency to 87% proficiency. The new assessed standards using a new platform contributed to create a learning curve to both students and teachers which negatively impacted the results.

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.

All areas assessed indicated that our school's performance was greater than the state average.

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

The Geometry EOC showed the most improvement in scores from 75% in 2022 to 85% in 2023 resulting in 10 percentage points increase. Targeted learning was established in the classroom, Quarterly data chats were conducted with the students. The identified low performing students participated in Academic review and scheduled enrichment sessions were designed to review identified assessed standards.

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

One significant area of concern for MAST @ Homestead revolves around the decline in reading scores observed among the accountability group for the 2022-2023 school year. The issue is of great importance as reading proficiency is a fundamental skill that is essential to success in the other rigorous courses our students take. The lower score compared to the prior year indicates a need for immediate support to enhance their reading abilities.

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

Improving ELA proficiency by one percentage point for the 2023-2024 school year, improving Geometry proficiency by one point for the 2023-2024 school year, and improving the passing rate of AP Statistics by two percentage points for the 2023-2024 school year.

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 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.

Although the 2023 Geometry EOC results demonstrated an increase in scores of 10 percentage points from 75% to 85% proficiency, the school goal is to reach 86% proficiency. The anticipated results will also increase the percentage of students who are meeting the graduation requirements by their junior year.

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

The school will increase the EOC Geometry scores by 1% point in 2024 resulting in 86% proficiency.

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

The area of focus will be monitored weekly by the teachers through classroom assessments. The scheduled data conversation will provide a clear action step to be taken in order to increase the performance. Data driven instruction will be at the core of the learning and teaching.
The administrative team will conduct quarterly data chats with the teachers and identified students in order to provide feedback and support in meeting the set goal. Supplemental activities such as Intervention and tutoring will be implemented for the students in need of remediation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

David Cadaval (dcadaval@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.)

Differentiated Instruction is a framework that will be implemented for effective teaching to provide students with different avenues to learning 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.

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

Differentiated Instruction was selected because in order to monitor learning gains progress which result in higher levels of performance, DI strategies will result in opportunities to address individual student needs.

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.

Data review of Baseline

Person Responsible: David Cadaval (dcadaval@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23 - 09/29/23

Meeting with teachers and students

Person Responsible: Rachelle Baril (pr7171@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23 - 09/29/23

Teacher / student data conversation

Person Responsible: Rachelle Baril (pr7171@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23 - 09/29/23

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

The 2023 ELA results demonstrated a decrease in scores of 5 percentage points from 92% to 87% in proficiency, the school goal is to reach 88% proficiency. The anticipated results will also increase the percentage of students who are meeting the graduation requirements by their junior year.

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

The goal is to increase the proficiency level in ELA by one percentage point from 87% to 88%.

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

The area of focus will be monitored weekly by the teachers through classroom assessments. The scheduled data conversation will provide a clear action step to be taken in order to increase the performance. Data driven instruction will be at the core of the learning and teaching.
The administrative team will conduct quarterly data chats with the teachers and identified students in order to provide feedback and support in meeting the set goal. Supplemental activities such as Intervention and tutoring will be implemented for the students in need of remediation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rachelle Baril (pr7171@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.)

Standards Based Grading (SBG) refers to grading based on mastery of the standard. The idea that a grade should be a reflection of what a student understands in relation to the standard being taught. Teachers assess the student output and grade according to the mastery level of the standard that was demonstrated.

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

Standards Based Grading was selected because all grades will be based on the students' performance on specific standards, which will result in ongoing feedback and remediation.

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 administration will review baseline data with teachers and students.

Person Responsible: David Cadaval (dcadaval@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23 - 09/29/23

Meeting with teachers and students will take place to discuss areas needing additional attention and remediation.

Person Responsible: David Cadaval (dcadaval@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23 - 09/29/23

Teacher / student data conversation.

Person Responsible: David Cadaval (dcadaval@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23 - 09/29/23

#3. 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.

According to the 2022-2023 AP Statistics performance data, 6% of AP students were proficient in AP statistics as compared with prior year's performance of 18%.

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

The goal for proficiency for AP Statistics for the 2023-2024 school is 20% scoring three or higher on the College Board exam.

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

The area of focus will be monitored weekly by the teacher through classroom assessments. The scheduled data conversation will provide a clear action step to be taken in order to increase the performance. Data driven instruction will be at the core of the learning and teaching.
The administrative team will conduct quarterly data chats with the teacher and identified students in order to provide feedback and support in meeting the set goal. Supplemental activities such as Intervention and tutoring will be implemented for the students in need of remediation. The teacher will be provided mentoring opportunities as well.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Data-Driven Instruction is an educational approach that relies on the teacher's use of student performance data to inform instructional planning and delivery. This systematic approach of instruction uses assessment, analysis, and actions to meet student's needs. Data-Driven Instruction may include developing Instructional Focus Calendars (IFC) to inform teachers on specific standards to target during instruction throughout the year, based on data outcomes.

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

These practices will assist in providing timely feedback to the teachers, who in turn will have a better understanding of student performance throughout the year. Regarding professional development, we want to assure we have continual professional growth that assists the process of quipping teachers with the tools necessary to monitor their students' progress effectively.

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.

Quarterly data chats to discuss progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Rachelle Baril (pr7171@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23 - 09/29/23

AP Standard Assessment Monitoring to ensure College Board standards being addressed.

Person Responsible: Rachelle Baril (pr7171@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23 - 09/29/23

Mid-Year Assessment for AP to check progress.

Person Responsible: Rachelle Baril (pr7171@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23 - 09/29/23

AP Mentorship Feedback and Planning with a local mentor teacher with a successful tenure in AP Statistics.

Person Responsible: Rachelle Baril (pr7171@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23 - 09/29/23

#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.

Teacher recruitment and retention are essential to a successful positive school climate.

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

We will open opportunities for new staff members to provide input in school based decisions. The school will reduce the number of staff transfers out of the school for the 2023-2024 school year by half as compared to the previous year.

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

The input of new faculty members at the school site will be solicited at each meeting and staff will be advised in advance their input will be sought.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rachelle Baril (pr7171@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.)

Collective Efficacy can be seen as a staff's shared belief that through their collective action, they can positively influence student outcomes and achievement. In fact, research indicates that collective efficacy is the number one factor influencing student achievement.

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

In order to reduce the attrition of staff we will make a greater effort to include them in the decision making process this increasing the school's collective efficacy.

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.

Inclusion of new staff in department meetings.

Person Responsible: Rachelle Baril (pr7171@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23 - 09/29/23

Opportunities to collaborate with departmental peers.

Person Responsible: Rachelle Baril (pr7171@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23 - 09/29/23

Opportunities to share best practices at faculty meeting.

Person Responsible: Rachelle Baril (pr7171@dadeschools.net)

By When: 08/14/23 - 09/29/23

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: Math	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$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