Felix Varela Senior High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Felix Varela Senior High School

15255 SW 96TH ST, Miami, FL 33196

http://www.varelahs.com/

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.

We, the Felix Varela community, are committed to the belief that all students can learn. It is the community's shared responsibility to create an equitable and diverse environment that fosters life-long learning and respect for others.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Felix Varela Senior High School is dedicated to creating a quality learning environment which embraces innovative technology and instructional rigor to meet global challenges by cultivating a safe, nurturing, and equitable environment for students, teachers, parents and our 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
Sanchez, Adrian	Principal	As principal of Felix Varela Senior High School, Mr. Sanchez has a myriad of job duties and responsibilities. As the school's principal he is the instructional leader of the building which encompasses securing that the state and district curriculum, mandates, and graduation requirements are followed. Additionally, he supervises a master schedule that encompasses not only the state requirements, but also dual enrollment, Advanced Placement, Industry Certification. With a budget of over six million dollars, Mr. Sanchez is the school's fiscal and budget manager. He is responsible for all the hires, transfers, resignations as well as all other personnel issues. Other responsibilities include, but are not limited to: Building and Facilities Budget and FTE Operations Professional Development Leadership Capacity School Culture Mental Health Safety Health Audits Inspections
Brown, Alvin	Assistant Principal	As our Assistant Principal of curriculum, Mr. Alvin Brown, oversees accountability groups, school data, and professional development. Accountability groups, school data, and professional development drive the school's overall grade. Based on the data from the accountability groups, he is able to determine how to better serve stakeholders. In addition, he is able to identify instructional areas of weakness and provide mediation for these areas through professional development.
Leal, Lazaro	Assistant Principal	As our Assistant Principal overseeing testing, Mr. Lazaro Leal collaborates with all departments to guarantee the school is in compliance with all district, state and national testing protocols. Mr. Leal coordinates testing in all areas including FSA, EOC, ELL, Access and Advanced Placement assessments. Systematic testing calendars are constructed to ensure all students are provided with assessments which enable the school to meet district, state, and national mandates along with student graduation requirements.
Herris, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	As the Instructional Coach, Ms. Herris' job responsibilities are to make sure teachers have the skills and resources to be highly effective and that students learning and engagement is maximized. Ms. Herris is also on the Synergy Team, a Positive Behavior Coach, on the administrative team, Threat Assessment Team, PD Liaison, Professional Development Team (PLST), and is part of the Truancy Team. As part of the synergy team Ms. Herris ensures others obtain the experiences and training needed to develop new skills and capability. Ms. Herris promotes and highlights effective practices that build

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		teacher moral and influences the creation and sustainability of a positive school culture.
Escobar, Carlos	Graduation Coach	As part of the Synergy Leadership Team and Graduation Coach, Mr. Escobar examines school-wide trends and helps to make decisions that impact the school community. He also advises students and parents seeking schedule changes, promotes the PSAT and SAT examinations, and helps to make data-driven, school-wide decisions. Mr. Escobar is also the co-department chair for the English Department and serves on our school's Leadership Team.
Escobar, Diane	Teacher, K-12	As our Advanced Placement Director, Mrs. Escobar recruits and advises students, hosts evening AP events with parents, supports new and experienced AP teachers, and coordinates communication between all stakeholders within our AP Program. She analyzes state and district Biology test results to then develop curriculum and resources, provide support, and lead meetings for the Biology teachers based on this data. In addition to her focus on Biology, she also assists in recruiting students for AP courses, supporting our AP Capstone program, and planning/executing community events to inform parents of Advanced Placement opportunities for their children.

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.

Stakeholder involvement for the development of the SIP includes the school's leadership team, EESAC committee, faculty, parents, and students. Input from these stakeholders was collected from school climate surveys and student achievement data on standardized testing. This information was then analyzed to identify the school's critical focus points on overall improvement for the 2023-2024 school year.

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 by the school's leadership team to ensure effective implementation with fidelity throughout each phase. Also, the team will make revisions as necessary based on observations in order to ensure that student achievement is maximized and progress is being made towards overall improvement in meeting the stated goals.

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	96%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	75%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	462
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	178
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	315
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	465
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523
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	672

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	615

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	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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

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

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	49	55	50	46	54	51	46		
ELA Learning Gains				51			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			37		
Math Achievement*	30	43	38	33	42	38	29		
Math Learning Gains				49			24		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			25		
Science Achievement*	59	62	64	50	41	40	59		
Social Studies Achievement*	66	69	66	67	56	48	59		
Middle School Acceleration					56	44			
Graduation Rate	97	89	89	97	56	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	66	70	65	58	67	67	74		
ELP Progress	55	49	45	59			56		

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	422
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	97

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	615
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	97

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	45			
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	65			
HSP	60			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	57			

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%
2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
SWD	44			
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	45			
HSP	56			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	55			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

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
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	49			30			59	66		97	66	55
SWD	30			20			51	39		33	6	
ELL	31			23			48	42		70	7	55
AMI												
ASN	79										1	
BLK	48			35			67			73	5	
HSP	48			29			59	66		65	7	54
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	53			44			50	73		81	6	
FRL	42			25			55	62		65	7	55

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	46	51	43	33	49	62	50	67		97	58	59
SWD	26	38	32	29	44	61	33	47		96	32	
ELL	22	48	46	25	52	58	33	49		95	70	59
AMI												
ASN	67	73										
BLK	29	21		24	43			55		100	45	
HSP	46	52	44	33	49	62	51	68		96	58	59
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	59	60		42	41		58	47		100	63	
FRL	43	50	42	32	48	58	49	65		96	59	58

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	46	42	37	29	24	25	59	59		97	74	56
SWD	22	33	29	26	30	29	38	38		97	31	
ELL	23	40	41	23	25	23	42	27		95	73	56
AMI												
ASN										100	70	
BLK	47	31		8	15					100	47	
HSP	46	42	36	30	24	24	59	58		97	76	56
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	44	36		24	12		60	69		98	60	
FRL	44	41	37	26	23	22	57	55		97	74	51

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	43%	54%	-11%	50%	-7%
09	2023 - Spring	48%	51%	-3%	48%	0%

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

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	36%	52%	-16%	48%	-12%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	65%	-10%	63%	-8%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	62%	66%	-4%	63%	-1%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The data component demonstrating the lowest performance is Math proficiency for both Algebra 1 and Geometry EOC's.

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

Algebra 1 demonstrated the greatest decline with a 15% drop in proficiency from the prior school year. Contributing factors include improper placement for SPED students in Algebra AB and topic assessments not being conducted with fidelity.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Algebra 1 demonstrated the greatest achievement gap when compared to the state with a proficiency that was 22% below the state average.

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

College and Career Acceleration demonstrated the most improvement with a 9% increase from the prior year. Strategic student and teacher placement for CTE played a large role in this improvement.

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.

The school's highest priorities are increasing Algebra 1 proficiency, Geometry proficiency, accurate placement of SPED students in Algebra AB, implementation of Viper Transformers mentorship program, and successful implementation of conflict resolution 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 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 Algebra 1 EOC Spring 2023 data, students demonstrated a 15% decrease in proficiency as compared to the Spring 2022 assessment. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of improper student placement and not utilizing topic assessment data to differentiate instruction, we will implement intensive math courses and monitor topic assessment data for fidelity to differentiate instruction.

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

With the implementation of differentiated instruction, Mid-Year data will reflect a 5% increase from the first Topic Assessment for all Algebra 1 students reflecting greater mastery of the tested benchmarks by December 2023.

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

At the conclusion of each topic assessment, Algebra 1 teachers will analyze their class data and utilize it to target student deficiencies within small groups. Assistant Principal Burth will be responsible for monitoring the implementation by way of classroom walk throughs and student-work products.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cathina Burth (cburth@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.)

Differentiation and small-group instruction will be used to maximize student learning.

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

Differentiation and small-group instruction will allow us to maximize student learning in Algebra 1 by providing students with daily math interaction. This will be achieved through the master schedule by providing intensive Algebra 1A and Algebra 1B to level 1 and level 2 students. By offering Algebra class daily, this will increase the frequency of math concepts being reviewed while providing students' with multiple opportunities to grapple with specific math examples. This will be made possible through the teacher interventions which will support the objectives covered daily.

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.

8/17/23-9/29/23 Teachers will administer baseline assessments. The AP over Math and department head will analyze data and provide results to teachers. Teachers will use whole group, differentiated instruction, Algebra Nation, and/or Khan Academy to provide intense instruction in deficient areas.

Person Responsible: Cathina Burth (cburth@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/2023

8/17/23-9/29/23 Teachers will develop lesson plans that address students' specific learning needs. As a result, teachers will student groups appropriate resources, and lesson plans that reflect differentiation within whole group instruction as well as small groups.

Person Responsible: Cathina Burth (cburth@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/2023

8/17/23-9/29/23 Monthly math department reviews of Algebra 1 data and student progress as it relates to mastery of the tested standards.

Person Responsible: Cathina Burth (cburth@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

According to the Geometry EOC administered in the Spring 2023, students demonstrated 36% proficiency. This reflects a proficiency that is 16% below the district's average of 52%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of improper student placement and not utilizing topic assessment data to differentiate instruction, we will implement intensive math courses and monitor topic assessment data for fidelity to differentiate instruction.

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

With the implementation of differentiated and small-group instruction, Mid-Year data will reflect a 7% increase from the first Topic Assessment for all Geometry students reflecting greater mastery of the tested benchmarks by December 2023.

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

At the conclusion of each topic assessment, Geometry teachers will analyze their class data and utilize it to target student deficiencies within small-group instruction. Assistant Principal Burth will be responsible for monitoring the implementation by way of classroom walk throughs and student-work products.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cathina Burth (cburth@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.)

Differentiation and small-group instruction will be used to maximize student learning.

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

Differentiation and small-group instruction will allow us to maximize student learning in Geometry by providing students with daily math interaction. This will be achieved through the master schedule by providing intensive Algebra/Geometry to support students in passing their Algebra 1 Retakes in October 2023. By offering math class daily, this will increase the frequency of math concepts being reviewed while providing students' with multiple opportunities to grapple with specific math examples. This will be made possible through the teacher interventions which will support the objectives covered daily.

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.

8/17/23-9/29/23 Teachers will administer baseline assessments. The AP over Math and department head will analyze data and provide results to teachers. Teachers will use whole group, differentiated instruction, and Khan Academy to provide intense instruction in deficient areas.

Person Responsible: Cathina Burth (cburth@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/2023

8/17/23-9/29/23 Teachers will develop lesson plans that address students' specific learning needs. As a result, teachers will student groups appropriate resources, and lesson plans that reflect differentiation within whole group instruction as well as small groups.

Person Responsible: Cathina Burth (cburth@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/2023

8/17/23-9/29/23 Monthly math department reviews of Geometry data and student progress as it relates to mastery of the tested standards.

Person Responsible: Cathina Burth (cburth@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/2023

#3. 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.

Based on the school climate survey data from 2022-2023, student responses reflected a 13% increase in feeling that violence is a problem at their school. A contributing factor may have been an increase in idle time before school, during lunches, and after school. This additional time led to more verbal confrontations, and sometimes physical altercations, that required administrative attention.

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

As a result to changes in the master schedule, reducing the amount of free time along with the implementation of conflict-resolution strategies from grade level counselors and administrators, we expect to see a 10% decrease in the number of students feeling that violence is a problem at the school.

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

This area of focus will be monitored by way of case management forms and SESIR reports reviewed by grade level administrator on a monthly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lazaro Leal (lazaroleal@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.)

Incentives will be provided to the grade level with the fewest amount of conflict-based infractions per month as reflected in the SESIR report.

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

Incentivizing positive behaviors to encourage an overall reduction in verbal confrontations and, in turn, a decrease in physical altercations.

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.

8/17/23-9/29/23 A change in the lunch schedule to add an additional shift of students as well as reduce lunch times from 45 minutes to 35 minutes.

Person Responsible: Lazaro Leal (lazaroleal@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/2023

8/17/23-9/29/23 Varying the disbursement of security and staff assigned to the designated lunch areas to minimize heavily congested areas and maintain supervision for the duration of lunch.

Person Responsible: Cathina Burth (cburth@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/2023

8/17/23-9/29/23 Grade-level counselors will be making classroom visits and presenting strategies on conflict-resolution and "see something, say something".

Person Responsible: Lazaro Leal (lazaroleal@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/2023

#4. 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.

Based on the school climate survey data from 2022-2023, student responses reflected a 4% decrease in feeling that their teachers are interested in how they do in the future. The school's leadership team will implement a mentorship program, Viper Transformers, where faculty members are matched with students at-risk and/or recommended by teachers/counselors.

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

With the implementation of Viper Transformers, we project a 10% increase from participating students feeling their teachers are interested in how they do in the future.

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

This will be monitored by monthly surveys for both faculty and students involved in the mentorship program, Viper Transformers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lazaro Leal (lazaroleal@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 school's leadership team will implement a mentorship program, Viper Transformers, for students at-risk and/or recommended by teachers or counselors.

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

Implementing the mentorship program will allow the opportunity for students to receive support from a faculty member in order to make improvements in their academic and social growth.

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.

8/17/23-9/29/23 Identify at-risk students by way of PM1 results, topic assessments, disciplinary actions and/or teacher recommendation.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Herris (sherris@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/2023

8/17/23-9/29/23 Assign small groups of at-risk students to a faculty/staff member to begin the Viper Transformers mentorship program.

Person Responsible: Adrian Sanchez (243803@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/2023

8/17/23-9/29/23 Mentors will meet with their Viper Transformers to discuss grades, progress towards graduation, involvement in extra-curricular activities, and additional support as needed.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Herris (sherris@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29/2023