

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Mast@Fiu School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Mast@Fiu

14301 BAY VISTA BLVD, North Miami, FL 33181

mastfiu@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.

Our mission is to provide students with first-rate advanced academics and early career experiences in a university-based, technology-rich environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a unique high school experience in cooperation with Florida International University that includes college level courses, career experiences and technology coursework to prepare students for Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) related fields.

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
Sarmiento, Roberto	Principal	Mr. Sarmiento leads and upholds policy, programs, budgets, and curricular activities to promote the academic and professional advancement of staff and students by collaborating with his team in developing objectives to meet the needs of MAST@FIU.
Jolicoeur, Cindy	Assistant Principal	Ms. Jolicoeur assists in the implementation of all programs by providing direction to the staff in implementing goals and objectives through interaction and collaboration. She assists in the evaluation of staff, the facilities, and in initiating improvements in instructional and non-instructional areas. Ms. Jolicoeur assists with the implementation of the magnet program, outreach and recruitment of students. She works with Instructional Leaders in the implementation of workshops. She coordinates with Club and Activity Sponsors to promote a positive student experience.
Daniel, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Daniel is the Math Instructional Leader and Professional Development Liaison overseeing the progress of the STEM program. She provides training and updates to faculty and staff in District and accelerated learning programs. She disaggregates data and shares instructional recommendations from the staff. She assists the new staff and provides instructional support and updates to faculty.
Carro, Natalie	Teacher, K-12	Dr. Carro is an Instructional Leader overseeing the progress of the English Language Arts and Social Sciences departments. She provides training for faculty in ongoing accelerated learning programs by analyzing data and surveying staff and student interest. She assists new faculty members and provides instructional support and updates to faculty.
Spencer, Stacey-Ann	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Spencer is the Science Instructional Leader overseeing the progress of the Science Department, and STEM through Science Fair and SECME. She coordinates the implementation of hands-on laboratory activities school-wide. She provides training for faculty in ongoing accelerated learning programs by analyzing data, surveying staff and student interest. She assists new science faculty and provides instructional support and updates to faculty.
Cariski, Meredith	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Cariski-Rocha is the Journalism/Yearbook teacher in the ELA department that deals primarily with the freshman class and school culture. She works with instructional leaders in the implementation of workshops. She coordinates with Class Sponsors to promote a positive student experience.
Acevedo, Marie	School Counselor	Ms. Acevedo oversees the Student Services team and is responsible for post-secondary planning and the direction of Student Services, including scheduling, magnet recruitment, and scheduling activities while working closely with the university partner. She coordinates ESE and Special Programs Compliance as well as Dual Enrollment.

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.

Each school leadership team member was selected based on their leadership role and accessibility to staff. All school-site staff participate in the SIP development process through departmental or faculty meeting discourse and surveys.

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))

To provide students with career experiences and advanced academics, the SIP will be monitored for effective implementation regularly by the identified school leaders, whose responsibility includes sharing the progress monitoring data of the staff-inclusive SIP goals and the reflection of action plan results during each SIP phase.

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	70%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	57%
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) 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

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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	24
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	3

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	3

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	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*	96	55	50	95	54	51	95		
ELA Learning Gains				72			71		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				80			67		
Math Achievement*	98	43	38	95	42	38	66		
Math Learning Gains				89			24		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile							30		
Science Achievement*	100	62	64	100	41	40	95		
Social Studies Achievement*	100	69	66	98	56	48	93		
Middle School Acceleration					56	44			
Graduation Rate	99	89	89	100	56	61	100		
College and Career Acceleration	93	70	65	96	67	67	88		
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	98
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	586
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	99

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	92
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	825
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
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				
ELL	88			
AMI				
ASN	94			
BLK	95			
HSP	97			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	98			

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	98			

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	77			
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	75			
HSP	93			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	94			
FRL	91			

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	96			98			100	100		99	93	
SWD												
ELL	88										1	
AMI												
ASN	94										1	
BLK	100			100						80	4	
HSP	92			96			100	100		96	6	
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	99							100		94	4	
FRL	94			100				100		97	5	

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	95	72	80	95	89		100	98		100	96	
SWD												
ELL	83	74	73									
AMI												
ASN	87	53										
BLK	89	66	70									
HSP	98	73	88	100	85		100	97		100	98	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	96	77	81	100	100		100	100		100	94	
FRL	95	71	84	93	87		100	97		100	94	

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	95	71	67	66	24	30	95	93		100	88	
SWD												
ELL	76	65	67	50								
AMI												
ASN	91	82										
BLK	94	76	82							100	76	
HSP	94	65	57	67	21		100	96		100	95	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	96	78	79	86	43		86			100	86	
FRL	94	68	65	50	15		90	90		100	89	

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	97%	54%	43%	50%	47%
09	2023 - Spring	91%	51%	40%	48%	43%

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	98%	52%	46%	48%	50%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	65%	35%	63%	37%

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

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Compared to the previous year, the 2022-2023 achievement data showing the lowest performance was English Language Arts (ELA) FAST scores. Schoolwide ELA scores include both 9th and 10th-grade data. Grade nine ELA scores decreased seven percentage points to 91% in the 2022-2023 year. Grade ten ELA scores decreased three percentage points to 97% in the 2022-2023 school year. Factors contributing to last year's lower performance include increased ELL students within those grade levels and in staff absences.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year remains ELA FAST scores for grade nine and the ELL subgroup. Factors contributing to the decline from the prior year include a slight increase in the ELL population and in staff absences.

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

The data components with the greatest gap compared to the state average remain BEST Geometry EOC, Biology, and United States History End of Course exams since all exceeded the state average at 98%, 100%, and 100%, respectively. Factors contributing to the incline include reorganizing staff course assignments to align with school needs and their area of expertise.

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

The data component displaying the most improvement remains math, science, and social studies end-of-course exams and Advanced Placement (AP) subject area exams. All aforementioned state assessments increased. All AP subject area exams exceeded the global average, and students scoring 3, 4, and 5 on the AP exams increased by 11%. New actions attributing to this increase include AP curriculum support through in-service opportunities at the school site highlighting strategies, the development of Year-at-a-Glance documents for all AP courses, AP Saturday Bootcamp, and the communication and teamwork of staff during faculty meetings geared toward data-driven instructional planning.

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

A potential area of concern includes student attendance.

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

Embedding ESOL strategies into English Language Arts to address subgroups, continue to implement progress monitoring and data-driven instruction in all subject areas, increase hands-on laboratory activities in the science classrooms, create opportunities where teacher-student interaction promotes a safe and inclusive environment with meaningful work, as well as implement an attendance campaign for both students and staff to reduce absenteeism.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The 2022-23 FAST PM 3 data shows that 91% of our 9th-grade students were proficient in ELA. Compared to the 9th-grade proficiency scores in 2022, this shows a decline of four percentage points.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Utilizing Benchmark-Aligned Instruction, 96% of our 9th-Grade students at MAST@FIU will achieve a proficiency score of Level 3 or higher on the third Progress Monitoring administration of the FAST ELA examination.

Monitoring:

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

The ELA department will meet monthly to reflect on student achievement data and instructional best practices. The ELA 9th and 10th-grade teachers will embed at least two ESOL strategies into their instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natalie Carro (ncarro@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.)

Teachers will utilize data-driven instructional strategies. Data-driven instruction will allow teachers to use authentic, formative, and summative student data to inform teaching and learning. Teachers will use data to clarify, share, and understand learning intentions and criteria with students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data-driven instruction will empower teachers to reflect, adjust, and implement lesson plans with fidelity. The decline in ELA learning gains in 2022-2023 suggests that data-driven instruction in the ELA classroom is essential. In order to meet the desired need of improving ELA learning gains, teachers will disaggregate PM1 data in their departments for areas of strength and weakness. Teachers will share best practices to ameliorate areas of weakness and monitor student progress.

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.

Ensure all ELA teachers have the CPALMS Standards App for their courses as well as access to ELA resources through Schoology. In doing so, ELA teachers will be equipped with resources to interpret PM1 data for lesson planning purposes.

Person Responsible: Natalie Carro (ncarro@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 30th, 2023 - October 13th, 2023

ELA teachers will participate in monthly collaboration meetings that include data chats focused on areas of strength and weakness to share best practices.

Person Responsible: Natalie Carro (ncarro@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 30th, 2023 - October 13th, 2023

Ninth and Tenth grade ELA teachers will participate in an in-service that includes ESOL strategies to embed at least two strategies into their instructional delivery to reach all learners.

Person Responsible: Meredith Cariski (meredithcariski@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 30th, 2023 - October 13th, 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**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.

Data from the past two scholastic years indicate that science has maintained 100% proficiency despite teacher attrition. However, with new staff, the science department will increase hands-on laboratory activities so students can gain an experiential understanding of concepts.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The science department will make a unified effort to implement more hands-on labs each quarter which will increase student acquisition of content and in doing so, sustain 100% proficiency in the Biology EOC.

Monitoring:

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

The Science Instructional Leader (IL) will manage lab materials and assist science staff in acquiring the materials needed for labs when requested. Based on the frequency of lab material requests, preparation, and evidence of implementation, the Science IL will look for correlations with ongoing topic assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacey-Ann Spencer (smspencer@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 purpose of hands-on instruction is to help teachers model correcting mistakes by addressing misconceptions and providing students with a safe space for trial and error, and skills practice while allowing students to learn through experiences, connections, and sense-making.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this strategy is to maintain our success of 100% science proficiency by adhering to the MAST@FIU vision and mission which entails providing STEM-related experiences that promote higher education.

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 science department will increase the number of hands-on lab activities completed each quarter. The Science Instructional Leader (IL) will monitor and assist in lab management when needed. An increase in hands-on labs will also increase experiential references in science so that students can respond to exams measuring their acquisition of content.

Person Responsible: Stacey-Ann Spencer (smspencer@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 30th, 2023 - October 13th, 2023

The Science department will stay abreast of their data from topic assessments and STEM projects to drive instruction. Data chats between the Instructional Leader (IL) and Biology teachers will ensure that data literacy is implemented.

Person Responsible: Stacey-Ann Spencer (smspencer@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 30th, 2023 - October 13th, 2023

The Science Department will devise a smoother process for student monitoring of their data by establishing data chat forms for students to actively input data and reflect on their strengths and weaknesses. In doing so, students will also have ownership of their data and be self-aware of their needs.

Person Responsible: Stacey-Ann Spencer (smspencer@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 30th, 2023 - October 13th, 2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2023 Advanced Placement Scores and longitudinal AP data, all AP courses saw significant increases in scores compared to years previous. All AP courses tested in 2022-2023 saw an increase in student achievement scores of levels three or more. This success must be maintained.

Measurable Outcome:

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

All Advanced Placement course exam averages at MAST@FIU will exceed each course's global AP score average by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

Advanced Placement teachers will attend monthly collaborative meetings to share AP best practices and lesson plans. Walkthroughs using the Teacher-Driven-Observation (TDO) model will be implemented for collaboration and feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cindy Jolicoeur (cjolicoeur@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-aligned instruction and instructional coaching support will be utilized to continue to propel student acquisition of content in the AP classroom. Instructional coaching will allow for modeling best practices and opportunities for reflection to guide instructional decision-making that meets the needs of the students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To meet the needs of student learners, teachers work together in the instructional coaching model to empower one another in the AP classroom to uphold the surpassing of the global passing rate for each AP course. For example, teachers will share components of their lessons with one another, reviewing the AP Course Exam Descriptors (CED) to clarify changes to instruction that adhere to the CED and have brought about positive achievement scores so that other teachers can implement should they choose.

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.

Ensure that all AP teachers have access to the AP classroom and approve their syllabi in the AP Course Audit process resulting in all AP teachers creating assessments through the AP classroom that can be used to guide instruction.

Person Responsible: Roberto Sarmiento (rsarmiento@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 30th, 2023 - October 13th, 2023

Share data related to AP courses and assist teachers in navigating their Instructional Report data in College Board. As a result, teachers will reflect on their strengths and areas of growth to guide their lesson planning.

Person Responsible: Cindy Jolicoeur (cjolicoeur@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 30th, 2023 - October 13th, 2023

AP teachers will create or revise a 'Year-at-a-Glance' document that reflects the skills and objectives of their course. This working document will pace the content of the AP course so that all content is covered before the course's AP exam date. As a result, teachers will create and maintain an adequate pace that ensures all course objectives are taught with fidelity while allowing ample review time. ILs will monitor teacher YAG implementation and encourage professional development for AP courses.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Daniel (sdaniel@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 30th, 2023 - October 13th, 2023

#4. 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 2022-2023 Staff Early Warning Indicators, 84% of staff had six or more absences compared to 73% of District staff. Absenteeism in the workplace results in reduced productivity, poor service, increased labor cost, or inconvenience due to substitute coverage of another teammate, leading to lower morale. For these reasons, teacher attendance is an area of focus in promoting a positive school culture.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Through weekly accessibility and visibility, celebrating attendance and successes, the administrative team and Student Services will build relationships that will boost morale by ten percentage points on the next climate survey.

Monitoring:

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

The principal will ensure that all administrators are visible and accessible weekly by conducting consistent and ongoing instructional walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Roberto Sarmiento (rsarmiento@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.)

Leadership Visibility and Accessibility is the evidence-based strategy that is targeted for implementation. Leadership visibility inspires people by providing opportunities to inspect, direct, or correct.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Administrative and leadership team visibility and accessibility provide staff and students opportunities to communicate and reflect through shared responsibility. In doing so, a culture of communication and a comfortable environment should encourage increased attendance and participation of both staff and students in school-related functions.

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 be visible during classroom transitions and maintain an open-door policy for stakeholders resulting in increased communication and shared responsibility.

Person Responsible: Roberto Sarmiento (rsarmiento@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 30th, 2023 - October 13th, 2023

The administration will incentivize attendance per department to encourage positive competition and group support to be present. A leader board will contain each department's attendance.

Person Responsible: Cindy Jolicoeur (cjolicoeur@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 30th, 2023 - October 13th, 2023

The administration will coordinate with teachers to celebrate successes and recognize their accomplishments and contributions to the Manta community through daily announcements resulting in celebrating successes and cultivating a culture of collaboration that will boost staff morale.

Person Responsible: Cindy Jolicoeur (cjolicoeur@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 30th, 2023 - October 13th, 2023

The Student Services Team will avail themselves to students and staff to articulate their academic or wellness needs resulting in an increase in academic and social-emotional awareness which will encourage being present.

Person Responsible: Marie Acevedo (marie.acevedo@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 30th, 2023 - October 13th, 2023

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

Not a TSI/CSI school.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Attendance	\$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.

No