Biotech@Richmond Heights 9 12 High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Biotech@Richmond Heights 9 12 High School

15020 SW 102ND AVE, Miami, FL 33185

biotech@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.

BioTECH @ Richmond Heights 9-12, in collaboration with its partners, aims to deliver an interdisciplinary, rigorous and relevant STEM education to develop successive generations of researchers who will apply their ingenuity and training to the conservation of life on Earth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through participation in a STEM research-based curriculum, BioTECH @ Richmond Heights 9-12 will develop global citizens with deep understanding of the value of all living organisms for the sustainability of Earth's biosphere.

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
Sterling, John	Principal	Mr. Sterling, as Principal, serves as a member of the administrative team to develop and implement the total school program. He provides direction to staff in implementing goals and objectives and interacts/meets with staff to assist in their own development. He evaluates the school program and staff and assists to initiate needed improvements.
Garcia, Wendy	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Garcia-Costa, as Assistant Principal, serves as a member of the administrative team to develop and implement the total school program. She assists in providing direction to staff in implementing goals and objectives and interacts/meets with staff to assist in their own development. She assists in the evaluation of the school program and of staff and assists to initiate needed improvements.
Florian, Nicole	Magnet Coordinator	Nicole Florian serves as the Magnet Lead Teacher and School Assessment Coordinator. As part of the Administrative Team, she assists with the implementation of the Magnet theme program, outreach and recruitment of students. . As the SAC, Florian organizes and monitors state and local student assessments at BioTECH in accordance with the procedures outlined for each program.
Martinez, Alejandro	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Martinez, serves as a Social Studies Teacher and Department Chairperson of Social Sciences & Electives. He analyzes needs, interests, strengths, and weaknesses of students, develops lesson plans, and monitors student progress using data. As a department chairperson he oversees department meetings, maintains textbooks and technological inventories, and provides training for faculty and staff with other ongoing learning programs.
Morera, Adrianna	School Counselor	Mrs. Morera serves as School Counselor and assists with CAP advisement. She analyzes needs, interests, strengths, and weaknesses of students and monitors student progress using data. As a member if the Leadership Team she assists with parent meetings and provides training for faculty and students on academic opportunities and requirements.
Morales, Yoanny	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Morales serves as Department Chairperson of Mathematics. She analyzes needs, interests, strengths, and weaknesses of students, assists teachers in the development of lesson plans, and monitors student progress using data. As a department chairperson she oversees department meetings, maintains textbooks and technological inventories, and provides training for faculty and staff with other ongoing learning programs.

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.

The school leadership team & instructional staff review the SIP and progress towards goal during the regularly scheduled faculty and departmental meetings. Student input is obtained during council meetings, surveys and EESAC representation. Stakeholders collaborate via reflective discourse on the effectiveness of the implementation of the indicated steps, as well as, identifying continued areas of growth.

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 implementation and effectiveness of the action steps indicated in the SIP will be monitored via classroom walkthroughs, student progress monitoring, department meeting & professional learning minutes, staff & student feedback, and parental input. The leadership team will review the data points as they relate to the action steps and will be discussed monthly at Curriculum Council. As a staff, the information will be shared, feedback obtained and additional action steps developed at monthly faculty and/or departmental meetings. Adjustments will be made in collaboration with stakeholders. Actions steps that are not successfully implemented will be reviewed and re-written for more gradual implementation.

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	89%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	70%
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) 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: 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	

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	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
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	25

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	43

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	1
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	
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*	81	55	50	77	54	51	61		
ELA Learning Gains				72			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64			53		
Math Achievement*	62	43	38	50	42	38	33		
Math Learning Gains				64			21		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			32		
Science Achievement*	88	62	64	86	41	40	83		
Social Studies Achievement*	95	69	66	84	56	48	77		
Middle School Acceleration					56	44			
Graduation Rate	96	89	89	98	56	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	63	70	65	63	67	67	50		
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	81
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	96

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	720
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	98

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	70			
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	81			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	86			

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	75			

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	56			
ELL	68			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	75			
HSP	72			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	70			

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	81			62			88	95		96	63	
SWD	79			45			77	90		31	6	
ELL	62			46			64				3	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	81			60			88	97		65	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	88			90				82		70	5	
FRL	73			43			77	94		64	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	77	72	64	50	64	62	86	84		98	63	
SWD	56	63	53	33	45		75	62		100	20	
ELL	73			28	69			100				
AMI												
ASN												
BLK										100	50	
HSP	77	71	61	52	65	63	89	83		98	64	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	88	76		50								
FRL	77	70	70	48	59	56	82	85		97	56	

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	53	53	33	21	32	83	77		97	50	
SWD	25	33	54	33	38		69	75		100	40	
ELL	52	61	73	29	25							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK				9								
HSP	63	55	54	34	22	38	85	74		98	48	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	59	44		55	20			92		100	60	
FRL	61	52	69	32	21	30	85	76		96	47	

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	83%	54%	29%	50%	33%
09	2023 - Spring	77%	51%	26%	48%	29%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	56%	8%	50%	14%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	52%	14%	48%	18%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	65%	23%	63%	25%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	66%	29%	63%	32%

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 data. the component showing the lowest performance was Acceleration. Acceleration rate remained static from 21-22 to 22-23 with a 63% performance outcome. The contributing factors impacting improvement were: student eligibility for Dual Enrollment, student interest, and performance on Advanced Placement exams.

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

No data point demonstrated a decline from the prior year.

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 Data points are above State and District averages in addition to demonstrating growth from prior year data. ELA Grade 10 showed a 33% gap when compared to the state. The factors that contributed to this was the implementation of vocabulary development, standards based instruction, authentic reading and writing, differentiated instruction, and close reading.

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

The most improvement data was demonstrated in the overall Math proficiency score. Math showed an increase of 17%. Specifically, Geometry showed a 20% increase. The factors that contributed to this was the implementation of explicit mathematic vocabulary development, the use of mathematical connections, differentiated instruction, targeted intervention, and an increase of the use of visual representations.

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

1. Student attendance
2. Students with more than one failed course (9-12)
3. Students with missing graduation assessment requirements (11-12)

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

1. Acceleration (Increase in student enrollment in both Advanced placement courses and Dual Enrollment)
2. Positive School Culture
3. Continued academic growth as evidenced by student proficiency

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

According to the 2022-2023 Math EOC data, 66% of the Algebra students were proficient compared to 54% of state and 56% of District. According to the 2022-2023 Math EOC data, 67% of Geometry students were proficient compared to 49% of state and 52% of District. Based on the data and the identified contributing factor of: limited retention of prior and pre-requisite skills, student reading readiness levels limit the ability to master course specific standards. We will implement the Targeted Element of Intervention.

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

If we successfully implement Intervention in the Mathematics content area, then Math performance will increase a minimum of 5 percentage points to 72% percent.

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

The Leadership Team will conduct quarterly data chats, adjust groups on current data and follow-up with regular walk throughs to ensure quality instruction and proper implementation of selected strategies. Data will be analyzed during Leadership Team meetings to ensure students are demonstrating growth. We will monitor the effectiveness of the interventions through the following tools: topic test assessments, district assessments, work products and observation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Sterling (jsterling@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.)

Academic vocabulary instruction

Within the Targeted Element of Mathematics, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Intervention. We will utilize a variety of instructional approaches such as altering assignments to meet the needs of the students, assessing students on an ongoing basis to determine their readiness levels, using assessment results to adjust instruction as needed, providing a variety of options for how students can learn and demonstrating their knowledge, striving to make lessons engaging and meaningful, push-in/pull-out intervention, and after-school tutoring.

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

In order to promote students' academic strengths and learning gains, students will be provided with interventions to achieve the measurable outcome.

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 Math Department will conduct a data analysis and identify specific skills in need of remediation. Team will develop bell-ringers to address specific skills for Topics 1 and 2.

Person Responsible: Yoanny Morales (ymorales3@dadeschools.net)

By When: by August 20, 2023.

The Math Department will identify course-specific academic vocabulary and develop an instructional implementation plan.

Person Responsible: Yoanny Morales (ymorales3@dadeschools.net)

By When: by September 29, 2023.

Student data chats will be held to include prior data and Topic 1 data.

Person Responsible: John Sterling (jsterling@dadeschools.net)

By When: by September 29, 2023.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

According to the 2022-2023 FAST Assessment for ELA, 67% of ninth graders were proficient as compared to 49% of state and 51% of District students. According to the 2022-2023 FAST Assessment for ELA, 83% of the tenth graders were proficient as compared to 50% of the state and 54% of the District students. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: number of students with special needs, prior student performance in writing and burgeoning changes with adaptive testing platform, we will implement the Targeted Element of Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model.

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

If we successfully implement the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model, then our
ELA percentage will increase by a minimum of 3 percentage points to 83 percent as evidenced on
the 2024 FAST Assessments.

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

The Leadership Team will conduct quarterly data chats, adjust groups on current data and follow-up with regular walk throughs to ensure quality instruction and proper implementation of selected strategies. Data will be analyzed during Leadership Team meetings to ensure students are demonstrating growth. We will monitor the effectiveness of the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model through the following tools: district assessments, AP1-AP3 data, FAST Assessment, work products and observation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Sterling (jsterling@dadeschools.net)

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

Within the Targeted Element of ELA, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Gradual Release of Responsibility Model. The ELA department will expand their understanding and implementation of the GRRM via participation in professional learning opportunities. Additionally, we will utilize a variety of instructional approaches such as altering assignments to meet the needs of the students, assessing students on an ongoing basis to determine their readiness levels, using assessment results to adjust instruction as needed, providing a variety of options for how students can learn and demonstrating their knowledge, and striving to make lessons engaging and meaningful.

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

In order to promote students' academic strengths and learning gains, students will be provided with interventions to achieve the measurable outcome.

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.

All teachers will participate in a Writing Workshop Professional Development session focusing on the organizational framework and thesis writing facilitated by school-based instructional leaders.

Person Responsible: Nicole Florian (nflorian@dadeschools.net)

By When: by August 20, 2023.

All teachers will participate in school-based professional development on the Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model.

Person Responsible: Nicole Florian (nflorian@dadeschools.net)

By When: by September 29, 2023.

The ELA Department will explain and disseminate Writing Workshop Organizational Foundational Frameworks obtained at the school-based professional development and evidenced by student work products.

Person Responsible: Wendy Garcia (wcosta@dadeschools.net)

By When: by September 29, 2023.

#3. 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.

As a result of the academic data review, we have determined that there has been no change to BioTECH's acceleration rate as evidenced by 63% acceleration rate in 2022 and 2023. Our goal is to increase acceleration by 10 percentage points to 73%. Due to the graduation cohort population size, every student's performance has a significant impact in the overall acceleration rate. This demonstrates that we need to continue to increase opportunities and support students with academic acceleration via Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement courses.

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

If we successfully identify and support our students, we will demonstrate an increase
of 10% in the acceleration rate at our school by the end of the 2023-2024 academic
year.

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

Through the use of annual FAST, GPA, and district assessment data, as well as, the AP Potential Report the leadership team at BioTECH will be able to monitor student eligibility for acceleration and provide support and guidance to students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wendy Garcia (wcosta@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.)

Our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Communicate with Stakeholders.. Ensure student academic progress monitoring to proactively provide support and guidance to individual students who may meet eligibility on the track to academic acceleration. As a Support Team, develop and facilitate parent and student
sessions on applicable topics such as: graduation requirements, college application process, dual enrollment, advanced placement courses and scholarships etc.

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

Monitoring student progress, providing individualized support, and strategies for reengagement (i.e. student meetings, parent communication, support services, intervention groups, incentives) will allow for proactive intervention to allow students the best opportunity to succeed academically and achieve their goal of high-school graduation.

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.

Identify students who meet eligibility for acceleration (i.e. Dual Enrollment)

Person Responsible: Wendy Garcia (wcosta@dadeschools.net)

By When: by August 31, 2023

Conduct a Student/Parent Information Session on the advantages and differences between Dual Enrollment, eligibility requirements, course offerings and expectations

Person Responsible: Nicole Florian (nflorian@dadeschools.net)

By When: by September 29, 2023

Facilitate the PERT assessment and MDC application process for identified students to participate in Dual Enrollment

Person Responsible: Nicole Florian (nflorian@dadeschools.net)

By When: by September 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, 75% of the teachers in 22-23 indicated that they felt students were deficient in basic academic skills as compared to 37% in 21-22. However, 74% of the students indicated that teachers believed they could succeed, 77% that they had to work hard for their academic grades, and 63% that their teachers wanted them to learn. As a result, the promotion of a growth mindset in student engagement as it relates to the high school experiences both academic and social was deemed essential.

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

Due to the need to promote the growth mindset to enhance the high school experience, if we successfully promote Student Engagement, then we will see an increase in student perception on teacher instruction and support, as well as, teacher perception on students' academic deficiencies, readiness for academic rigor and skill sets as indicated by the results on the 23-24 Climate Survey.

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

The Leadership Team will conduct quarterly data chats, adjust groups on current data and follow-up with regular walk throughs to ensure quality instruction and proper implementation of selected strategies. Data will be analyzed during Leadership Team meetings to ensure students are demonstrating growth. We will monitor the effectiveness through the following tools: student surveys, observation, course participation, club memberships/activities, school activities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wendy Garcia (wcosta@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.)

Our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Student Engagement. We will utilize a variety of instructional approaches such as: assessing students on an ongoing basis to determine their readiness levels, using assessment results to adjust instruction as needed, providing a variety of options for how students can learn and demonstrating their knowledge, striving to make lessons engaging and meaningful, employing different grouping formats for instruction, reflection, developing and delivering rigorous lessons and goal setting for the academic component. To address the social-emotional component, we will utilize the following approaches: increase student voice, surveys, promote participation, provide incentives for progress towards goal.

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

In order to promote a culture of student engagement, the team will focus on academic strengths and learning gains through the monitoring of assessment data and building student capacity, as well as, incentivize student participation in school-based events, clubs and other sponsored activities that promote school spirit.

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.

Conduct student interest survey for clubs, activities, field trips and school-sponsored events

Person Responsible: Wendy Garcia (wcosta@dadeschools.net)

By When: by September 29, 2023.

Analyze student academic data and conduct student informational sessions for academic engagement opportunities

Person Responsible: Adrianna Morera (adriannamorera@dadeschools.net)

By When: by September 29, 2023.

Host a Club Rush event on school-site to provide students the opportunity to interact with a variety of themed extracurricular club offerings

Person Responsible: Wendy Garcia (wcosta@dadeschools.net)

By When: by September 15, 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).