

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Miami Lakes Educational Center School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Miami Lakes Educational Center

5780 NW 158TH ST, Miami Lakes, FL 33014

<http://ml.ec.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 Miami Lakes Educational Center is to create a highly qualified future workforce by offering state-of-the art academic, career and technical education to all generations within our community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To facilitate, promote and provide successful career training opportunities and high academic standards for secondary and post-secondary students designed to meet the challenges of an ever-changing global economy.

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
Fernandez, Yaset	Principal	Mr. Fernandez is our Principal. Principal Fernandez leads the formulation of policies, organizational plans, goals and objectives of our school. He oversees all programs which engage various stakeholders at our school and provides valuable insight to guide our school's decision making process.
Windisch, Michael	Assistant Principal	Mr. Windisch is our Vice Principal. He assists Principal Fernandez in the formulation of policies, organizational plans, goals and objectives of our school. He oversees and spears all programs which engage various stakeholders at our school and provides valuable insight to guide our school's decision making process.
Triche-Eugene, Bertine	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Triche-Eugene is our Assistant Principal. She assists in the planning, development, organization, coordination, and supervision of instructional programs and activities. She also assists in overseeing the implementation of District approved curriculum programs in light of our school's needs.
Galarce, David	Magnet Coordinator	
Cimino, Edith	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Cimino is our Assistant Principal. She assists in the planning, development, organization, coordination, and supervision of instructional programs and activities. She also assists in overseeing the implementation of District approved curriculum programs in light of our school's needs.
Cordova, Katrina	Other	Ms. Cordova is our Activities Director. She assists our administration with the implementation of programs which assist in meeting the educational and social needs of our school community to enhance culture.
Chavis, Charlesette	Other	Ms. Chavis is our ELA Department Chairperson. She provides instructional leadership, support, and assistance to all teachers in the ELA Department. She also serves as a resource to support a standards-based curriculum, effective instructional strategies, and instructional materials.
Sands, Teri	Other	Ms. Sands is our Student Services Department Chairperson and CAP advisor. She provides support to all counselors in the Student Services Department, and assist students with the college admissions process.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Moffi, John	Other	Mr. Moffi is our Social Studies Department Chairperson. He provides instructional leadership, support, and assistance to all teachers in the Social Studies Department. He also serves as a resource to support a standards-based curriculum, effective instructional strategies, and instructional materials.
Mendez, Haydee	Other	Dr. Mendez is our Science Department Chairperson. She provides instructional leadership, support, and assistance to all teachers in the Science Department. She also serves as a resource to support a standards-based curriculum, effective instructional strategies, and instructional materials.
Vernon, Marlon	Other	Mr. Vernon is our CTE/Electives Department Chairperson. He provides instructional leadership, support, and assistance to all teachers in the CTE/ Electives Department. He also serves as a resource to support a standards-based curriculum, effective instructional strategies, and instructional materials.
DeArmas, Vanessa	Other	Ms. DeArmas is our Trust Specialist. She serves as a liaison between our school and mental health organizations and resources outside of our school. She provides students with access to individual or group counseling services and supports students' mental wellbeing as well as academic choices and situations.

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.

Miami Lakes Educational Center (MLEC) involves all stakeholders through several forms of communication, such as, emails, phone calls, meetings, and online posts regarding information on school news and events. The annual school-grade category data is analyzed by members of the leadership team at the yearly summer Synergy conference held by Miami Dade Public Schools. This information is shared with faculty and staff at the beginning of the school year to identify school needs and begin the school improvement process. The process helps to build the school plan and drives school improvement conversations and decisions. MLEC administration connects with faculty and staff by conducting leadership meetings that involves all department and academy leaders to reflect upon and update school information and data. The leadership team drives the conversation based on what is needed in the school improvement process according to data. The faculty meetings are utilized to keep teachers informed and involved in the school improvement process. Teachers are involved in the

process to identify their role in the school improvement process and ideas to implement. Also, MLEC hosts monthly EESAC meetings that involves community partners, teachers, parents, and students that creates opportunities to analyze ways to connect and collaborate on school improvement initiatives.

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 is effectively monitored through purposeful administrative walkthroughs, school data chats with faculty and staff, teacher-student data chats, and involving all stakeholders in the school improvement process. The SIP and school data will be analyzed in EESAC meetings, faculty meetings, department meetings and academy meetings every quarter with all stakeholders to identify school’s next steps and individual role to assist in the school improvement process. All stakeholders will have the opportunities in these meetings to compare progress monitoring data to action steps in the SIP, reflect in their personal role in the SIP and voice their vision for the next steps.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	98%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	88%
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	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
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	138

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

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

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	79	55	50	72	54	51	61		
ELA Learning Gains				68			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			38		
Math Achievement*	83	43	38	72	42	38	28		
Math Learning Gains				83			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				77			29		
Science Achievement*	70	62	64	58	41	40	53		
Social Studies Achievement*	72	69	66	78	56	48	70		
Middle School Acceleration					56	44			
Graduation Rate	97	89	89	100	56	61	100		
College and Career Acceleration	83	70	65	90	67	67	86		
ELP Progress	60	49	45	67			53		

* 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	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	544
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	97

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	821
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
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	61			
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	64			
BLK	77			
HSP	79			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	73			

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	78			

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	61			
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN	65			
BLK	73			
HSP	75			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	74			

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	79			83			70	72		97	83	60
SWD	45			59			43	47		73	6	
ELL	55			69			50	42		77	7	60
AMI												
ASN	64										1	
BLK	77			82			69	64		71	6	
HSP	82			83			68	75		89	7	61
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	73										1	
FRL	79			81			71	73		84	7	61

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	72	68	56	72	83	77	58	78		100	90	67
SWD	46	58	52	42	72	76	47	36		94	87	
ELL	42	58	53	63	83	63	48	46		100	92	67
AMI												
ASN	90	40										
BLK	69	70	59	68	79	80	52	77		100	78	
HSP	72	67	53	74	85	74	60	78		99	94	64
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75	87										
FRL	70	67	56	72	82	77	58	77		100	89	67

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	61	51	38	28	22	29	53	70		100	86	53
SWD	20	50	48	11	21	23	27			100	60	
ELL	31	44	43	16	19	23	32	27		100	75	53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	54	48	32	21	21	17	49	64		100	89	
HSP	63	52	41	32	22	34	53	71		100	84	50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75	73										
FRL	61	52	42	28	21	30	53	67		100	85	45

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	82%	54%	28%	50%	32%
09	2023 - Spring	78%	51%	27%	48%	30%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	76%	56%	20%	50%	26%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	52%	38%	48%	42%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	65%	4%	63%	6%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	66%	6%	63%	9%

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.

Based on the 2022-2023 assessment results, the US History EOC showed the lowest performance. It has shown a decline for the last three years. Contributing factors include: the hiring of a new teacher to instruct the course and low attendance at extended learning sessions.

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

Based on 2022-2023 US History EOC data, US History was identified as the area with the greatest need for improvement. In analyzing 2022-2023 EOC data in comparison with 2018-2019 AND 2021-2022 data, though data findings demonstrate to be at par with the State data, US History is the area which was furthest from achievement goals set based on previous achievement scores. Our proficiency goal for US History was 80%, and the actual proficiency was 8 percentage points less at 72%, identifying US History as our core area with the greatest need for improvement. The contributing factors to this decrease was the student grouping in each period and the limited intervention opportunities. There was low attendance at extended learning sessions and no incentive in place to motivate students to attend.

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 of our EOC assessment scores were above the state average. The greatest gap compared to the state average would have to be the Biology EOC. Our school scored a 69% proficiency level in the 2022-2023 Biology EOC compared to the state average of 63%. This indicates that we averaged 6 percentage points higher than the state average.

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

Based on the 2022-2023 Geometry EOC data, Geometry was identified as the area with the most improvement. In analyzing 2022-2023 EOC data in comparison with 2018-2019 AND 2021-2022 data, the data findings demonstrate that Geometry is the area with the most improvement and surpassed the proficiency goal. Our Geometry proficiency goal was 75% and the actual proficiency was 93%, 18 percentage points higher than our identified goal; identifying Geometry as our core area with the most improvement. The contributing factors to this increase was the teacher – student engagement in the classroom. Students displayed engagement more than 90% of the times during classroom walkthroughs and observation. The teacher was in her 2nd year teaching the subject and showed to have mastered the curriculum.

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

N/A

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

1. US History achievement levels
2. Continued increases in Biology achievement levels
3. Continued increases in acceleration

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 Social Studies**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 US History EOC, 72% of students accomplished proficiency level compared to the 2021-2022 US History EOC where 78% of students were proficient, which is a decrease of 6 percentage points. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of limited extended learning opportunities and a new teacher to the curriculum we will implement purposeful extended learning opportunities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With purposeful Extended Learning Opportunities, 77% of US History students will reach proficiency in the 2023-2024 US History EOC by June 2024 which will be an increase of 5 percentage points.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored by conducting focused administrative walkthroughs, conduct data chats after each mini assessment, and strategic collaborative planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Windisch (mwindisch@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 applied for this area of focus will be the implementation of purposeful Extended Learning Opportunities such as STEM Saturdays, After School Labs, Lunch with a Pro that will provide students with enrichment activities, testing preparation and fundamental content building.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

During the 2022-2023 school year, there was less than 5% attendance for tutoring sessions and minimal incentives were offered for students to attend the tutoring sessions. Also, tutoring sessions started in February, which made it difficult for students to get accustomed to attending.

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.

A data tracker by teacher will be created to monitor student progress with Performance Matters Data. As a result, teachers will use data trackers to monitor student progress in mini assessment and classroom checkpoints to differentiate instruction as needed.

Person Responsible: Michael Windisch (mwindisch@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/15/23

Meet with Social Studies department to analyze last year's data and identify targeted students for Extended Learning Opportunities, how to create engaging Extended Learning Opportunities and best practices.

Person Responsible: Michael Windisch (mwindisch@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/29/23

Meet with both the Social Studies and ELA departments to cross curricular plan and identify strategies to maximize opportunities to cover social studies standards in ELA classes.

Person Responsible: Michael Windisch (mwindisch@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/29/23

Meet with identified students to review scheduled Extended Learning Opportunities and data trackers.

Person Responsible: Michael Windisch (mwindisch@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/29/23

#2. 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.

According to the 2020-2021 College and Career Acceleration our school achieved 90% acceleration rate compared to the 2021-2022 College and Career Acceleration category our school achieved 85% acceleration rate, which is a 5 percentage point decrease. This was due to student scheduling and missed opportunities to maximize our certification programs. Given the accelerated programs that the school provides, we believe that making data-driven decisions for students' academic progress will benefit the school the most in the Acceleration school grade component.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we implement data-driven decision making for student academic progress, we should see our Acceleration component increase by 3 percentage points to 88% by June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will create an internal data tracker to monitor and track student acceleration throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Windisch (mwindisch@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 applied for this area of focus will be the implementation of Data-Driven Decision Making that will provide students with the best opportunity to take advantage of our educational programs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

During the 2022-2023 school year, there was 15% of seniors without an acceleration point that was identified to have not passed an AP, AICE, Dual Enrollment, or Industry Certification Exam. We want to improve in the process to schedule students into these classes that can provide students with an acceleration point and great educational experience.

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.

Meet with identified faculty to analyze the 2022-2023 Acceleration school grade component data to identify areas that can be improved and ideas that can be implemented to maximize student academic progress.

Person Responsible: Michael Windisch (mwindisch@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/20/23

A student data tracker will be created to monitor student acceleration progress with Career and Technical Education classes. As a result, administration will use data trackers to identify how to maximize student academic progress on a quarterly basis through leadership team meetings.

Person Responsible: Michael Windisch (mwindisch@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/29/23

Meet with identified student group that can benefit from an accelerated course and reinforce partnership to impact overall school performance.

Person Responsible: Michael Windisch (mwindisch@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/29/23

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance

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 teacher attendance data points, 19% of teachers had less than 5.5 absences compared to the district average of 23%, which is below by 4 percentage points.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With implementing the Attendance Initiatives evidence based strategy, 21% of teachers will have less than 5.5 absences by June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through data trackers, incentives presented by administration, friendly department competitions and presented at faculty meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Windisch (mwindisch@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 strategy that will be implemented is Attendance Initiatives. This strategy will incentivize teachers to be present at school and build a healthy competition among departments to have the highest teacher attendance percentage.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This evidence-based intervention is expected to build on the school's positive morale and gives teachers/ departments the opportunity to build comradery. The Attendance Initiatives will motivate and incentivize teachers to be present and ready to lead our students. This initiative will lead to more teaching time in the classroom and opportunities for students to experience the curriculum/subject.

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 2022-2023 teacher attendance will be shared with faculty to analyze and interpret crucial learning time lost in the classroom. This will assist teachers to take ownership of the new set goal.

Person Responsible: Michael Windisch (mwindisch@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/26/23

Form an attendance incentive committee to gather teacher input in identifying incentives they would like to see serve for the teacher attendance improvement initiative.

Person Responsible: Michael Windisch (mwindisch@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/29/23

Create a teacher attendance incentive plan to be presented to teachers during the faculty meeting.

Person Responsible: Michael Windisch (mwindisch@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/29/23

#4. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation

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 2021-2022 state graduation rate data, students accomplished 100% graduation rate compared to the 2022-2023 graduation data where students accomplished a 97% graduation rate. This is a 3 percentage point decrease. We are continuing to mitigate losses from the pandemic and since we are a full magnet school, it is our mission that every child graduate.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Intervention, 100% of students will graduate by June 2024. By providing students with evidence-based intervention sessions, it will allow targeted opportunities to fulfill all graduation requirements.

Monitoring:

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

Interventions will be monitored by creating and utilizing data trackers with student academic progress information, surveying student intervention needs and establishing an intervention calendar that all stakeholders can follow to support our students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Windisch (mwindisch@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.)

Providing students with Interventions, we will be giving students opportunities to partake in enrichment and/or fundamental activities that will prepare them to accomplish several of the graduation requirements they will need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The evidence-based intervention of providing Intervention was chosen because there was a 3 percentage point decrease in our graduation rate according to the 2022-2023 graduation rate data. At Miami Lakes Educational Center we believe through our school vision that every student should graduate to benefit from the many avenues of post-secondary education. In order to align with our school vision, we want to strive to perfection in this school accountability category as much as possible.

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.

Meet with the Student Services department to identify upper class students that are still missing a graduation requirement and create a plan for those students.

Person Responsible: Teri Sands (223146@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/26/23

Ensure that students missing the ELA or Algebra requirement are placed in the appropriate intensive reading or intensive math class.

Person Responsible: Michael Windisch (mwindisch@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/23

Meet with upperclassmen students that are still in need of a high school requirement to review personal plan and enhance a partnership with students.

Person Responsible: Michael Windisch (mwindisch@dadeschools.net)

By When: 09/29/23

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The school improvement plan is disseminated through various communication platforms that includes but is not limited to: the school website (www.mlecshs.com), Monthly EESAC Meetings, Annual Title 1 Meeting, Parent Resources Center, Faculty meetings, Academy and Department meetings. At the beginning of each meeting, the School Improvement Plan is shared with the member of the meeting to collect feedback, reassure that the goals are being met and identify each persons' role in the process.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school plans to utilize the following platforms to keep all stakeholders informed:

Annual open house

Monthly EESAC meetings

Annual Title 1 Meeting

Parent/Teacher/Administrator Conferences

Quarterly report cards

Progress reports midway through each quarter

Electronic gradebook which is accessible to parents through the Dadeschools Portal

Parent Resource Center

School Website: www.mlecshs.com

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

The school plans to strengthen the academic program through quarterly data chats that will include administration - teacher and teacher - student meetings to identify instructional strategies that the teacher can implement, students' academic strengths and weaknesses and classroom resources is needed to improve academic progress. The school will start early in the school year providing extended learning opportunities for students to receive intervention and enrichment activities to prepare them for the end of year assessments. Data trackers are developed to monitor student progress and drive decision to improve our academic programs.

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

This plan is developed in coordination with all stakeholders who are part of an academic program, student services, community partnership and/or parent involvement group. The school utilizes all school organizations and resources such as Project Up-Start, the TRUST Counselor, Health Information Project, college dual enrollment, and intervention program to ensure all students receive the best education the school can offer.