Iprep Academy North School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Iprep Academy North

1420 NE 215TH ST, Miami, FL 33179

northregion.dadeschoools.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 create a unique, collaborative environment that cultivates strong academic skills, knowledge, and the talents of STEM students and promotes life skills to increase student opportunities beyond graduation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to challenge, nurture, and empower students' creativity with a global, rigorous, technology-enhanced college-preparatory curriculum.

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
Garnica, Francisco	Principal	Oversees the daily activities and operations within the school.
Baptiste, Marieyola	Assistant Principal	Assists in overseeing the daily activities and operations within the school.
Guzman, Wendy	Teacher, K-12	Leads teachers in collaboration based on student data and teacher identified areas of growth.
Gbadebo, Samuel	Magnet Coordinator	Provides support to students and teachers in implementing the Cambridge curriculum, manages school activities, manages the gradebook, and coordinates testing activities.
Martinez, Penelope	School Counselor	Provides social and emotional support services to students.
Monzote, Yoel	Teacher, K-12	Leads teachers in collaboration based on student data and teacher identified areas of growth.

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 develops the SIP and assists in the completion of actions to address the areas of focus. At the beginning of the school year, members of the faculty and EESAC approve the SIP. Parents will also be involved through the PTSA for teacher recognition according to the Positive School Culture area of focus. The SLT took into consideration Students Climate Surveys and developed the Growth Mindset target goal to help students with social and emotional 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 SLT will monitor implementation of the areas of focus. Marieyola Baptiste will ensure that teachers have reviewed their data and identified the students that will need intervention in the form of tutoring, push-in and pull-outs, and will benefit from using resources such as iReady, MyOn, and CommonLit. Marieyola Baptiste and Wendy Guzman will monitor planning and preparation of common planning meetings. As the year continues, teachers will plan to meet with other subject areas for cross-curricular planning. Yoel Monzote will monitor the recognition of faculty for their work to build a growth mindset and improve social and emotional health in the classroom. Penelope Martinez will monitor the promotion of Growth Mindset at the classroom level and schoolwide.

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 6-12
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	46%
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
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	82	95	103	280
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	4	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	13
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	16	37
	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	2	3	1	6

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	1	4	1	13
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	39
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	23
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	26
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	14	16	48

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	7	7	30

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	1	4	8	13
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	10	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	3	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	19	22	58

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	3	3	0	6

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*	77	55	50	82	54	51	72		
ELA Learning Gains				66			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64			39		
Math Achievement*	88	43	38	81	42	38	55		
Math Learning Gains				74			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				71			16		
Science Achievement*	93	62	64	86	41	40	60		
Social Studies Achievement*	89	69	66	96	56	48	79		
Middle School Acceleration	87			83	56	44	54		
Graduation Rate		89	89		56	61			
College and Career Acceleration		70	65		67	67			
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](https://www.floridacims.org).

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	87
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	434
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	703
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

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	77			
ELL	73			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	83			
HSP	86			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	91			

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	84			

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	50			
ELL	68			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	78			
HSP	77			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	75			

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	77			88			93	89	87			
SWD	73			80							2	
ELL	45			83			72	86	78		5	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	83			80			83	90	77		5	
HSP	72			88			93	88	87		5	
MUL												

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												
PAC												
WHT	81			91			96	93	92		5	
FRL	74			85			91	81	87		5	

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
2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	82	66	64	81	74	71	86	96	83			
SWD	50	50										
ELL	57	54	58	65	72	64	84	85	70			
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	85	66	72	80	61	69	87	100	79			
HSP	80	69	58	77	76	71	86	93	81			
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	84	61	70	85	75	69	85	97	87			
FRL	79	63	66	75	68	69	84	94	77			

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
2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	72	54	39	55	22	16	60	79	54			
SWD												
ELL	57	48	50	34	12	11	54	69	35			
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	65	62		46	21							
HSP	69	50	39	50	20	10	63	77	55			
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	79	58	45	67	24	33	60	85	55			
FRL	70	56	43	41	18	18	58	71	40			

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. <u>The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments</u>.

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	63%	54%	9%	50%	13%
07	2023 - Spring	82%	50%	32%	47%	35%
08	2023 - Spring	77%	51%	26%	47%	30%
09	2023 - Spring	77%	51%	26%	48%	29%
06	2023 - Spring	82%	50%	32%	47%	35%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	99%	58%	41%	54%	45%
08	2023 - Spring	*	59%	*	55%	*

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	92%	40%	52%	44%	48%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	56%	28%	50%	34%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	52%	41%	48%	45%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	65%	29%	63%	31%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	68%	22%	66%	24%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	66%	19%	63%	22%

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 that showed the lowest performance was 10th grade ELA, as evidenced by the 2022 - 2023 FAST PM3 data with proficiency at 63 percent.

ELL subgroup trend/pattern: An observed trend is that students in the ELL subgroup underperformed in ELA when compared to the total school population, scoring an average of 64 percent proficiency compared to a school average of 88 percent proficiency in ELA. This is the lowest performing subgroup in ELA, as shown in the PowerBI AP Subgroups report. The pattern or underperformance by the ELL subgroup repeats itself in Science and Social Studies, but not in Math.

Ethnic subgroups: The highest performing subgroup was the White student subgroup, outperforming the Hispanic, Black, ELL, and SWD subgroups across all subject areas.

The performance in ELA, including among subgroups, was primarily due to the contributing factors of teacher attendance, a late onset of our pull-out interventions in ELA, a lack of teacher availability for after-school tutoring, and a deficiency in student readiness levels.

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 prior year was 8th grade ELA, as evidenced by the 2022 - 2023 FAST PM3 data. Proficiency declined by 7 percentage points, from 84 percent in the prior year to 77 percent in the 2022 - 2023 school year.

This was primarily due to the contributing factors of staffing changes, a late onset of our pull-out interventions in ELA, a lack of teacher availability for after-school tutoring, and a deficiency in student readiness levels.

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 school outperformed the state (and the district) across all tested areas. The data component that had the smallest positive gap when compared to the state average was 10th grade ELA (13 points above the state average), as evidenced by the 2022 - 2023 FAST PM3 data.

This was primarily due to the contributing factors of teacher attendance, a late onset of our pull-out interventions in ELA, a lack of teacher availability for after-school tutoring, and a deficiency in student readiness levels.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Geometry as evidenced by the 2022 - 2023 Geometry EOC assessment. Proficiency increased by 24 percentage points, from 72 percent in the prior year to 96 percent in the 2022 - 2023 school year.

New actions taken that contributed to this improvement were greater data analysis of PM 1 and 2 results and topic assessments. This analysis led to increased differentiated instruction (DI). DI occurred in small groups, peer-to-peer instruction, pull-out intervention groups, and in the after-school tutoring program.

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

As shown in the EWS data, two areas of concern are students in the middle school grades that are showing a substantial reading deficiency as defined by the state rule, students in the middle school grades that are performing at a level 1 in the ELA assessment, students in the middle school grades that are performing at a level 1 in the Math assessment, and students in the middle school grades that are performing at a level 1 in both the ELA and Math assessment.

Additionally, while not shown in the EWS, we are concerned about the high school performance on the ELA assessment, as the trends indicate a pattern of decline in average ELA performance as students advance from one grade level to the next.

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year are (ranked in order from highest to least priority):
1. Increasing ELA scores across all grade levels and focusing attention/resources on 10th grade
2. Increasing ELA scores for students in the ELL subgroup. As indicated above, students in this group underperformed when compared to the total school population scoring an average of 64 percent proficiency compared to a school average of 88 percent proficiency in ELA. This is the lowest performing subgroup as shown in the PowerBI AP Subgroups report.
3. Increasing Algebra 1 scores
4. Increasing Civics scores

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 Intervention

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 PM3 data, 63% of 10th graders were proficient in ELA which is a decrease from last year when 66% were proficient. 77% of 9th graders were proficient which is a decrease from 83% from last year. 77% of 8th graders were proficient which is a decrease from 84% from last year. Based on the data and contributing factors such as student readiness levels, we will implement the targeted element of intervention to address the instructional needs of lower performing students.

According to the 2022 – 2023 EOC Algebra data shows 84% proficiency. Even though there is an increase in the level of proficiency, there is room for improvement since Algebra 1 showed a 4% growth from 80% to 84% while the other Mathematics content areas showed double digit growth from 2022 to 2023. Based on this data and contributing factors such as student readiness levels, we will implement the targeted element of intervention to increase to address the instructional needs of lower performing students.

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

With the implementation of intervention, 4% of the students in each grade level will show an increase in their ELA scores by the Spring 2024 F.A.S.T. assessment. 8th grade students will show an increase from 77% to 81%. 9th grade students will increase from 77% to 81%. 10th grade students will show an increase from 63% to 67%.

Algebra 1 scores will increase by an additional 4% for a total of 88% as shown by the Spring 2024 EOC.

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

The School Leadership Team will review with the assistance from the teachers a data analysis for all students and then teacher will identify their students that will require intervention. After the implementation of push-in/pull-outs, interventions and tutoring after school programs, administration will conduct quarterly data chats to review the impact of interventions. School administration will evaluate progress with in-class topic assessments, informal assessments, and student work samples. Student action plans will be developed for students not showing growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@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.)

With the targeted element of intervention, our school will focus on the Evidence-based strategy of intervention to assist lower performing students. These students will be provided with pull-ins/push-outs, afterschool/Saturday tutoring and in-class interventions using iReady, Edgenuity, CommonLit, MyOn and teacher materials. Data chats will be conducted to monitor the progress of students and drive planning and instruction.

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

Intervention is a strategy used to teach a new skill, build fluency in a skill, or encourage a child to apply an existing skill to new situations or settings. Interventions will allow level 1 and 2 students to close learning gaps and to assist in transference of knowledge in a Cambridge setting.

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.

Using the Spring 2023 data, teachers will identify the students that are at Level 1, 2, and 3 for ELA and Algebra 1. Teachers will create a plan for DI and intervention for those students.

Person Responsible: Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

By When: By 8/31/23, teachers will identify students in ELA and Algebra 1 for intervention and will create a plan for DI.

Based on the teachers' lists and after parent contact, students will engage in pull-out intervention for ELA with interventionist.

Person Responsible: Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

By When: Between 8/17/23 - 9/29/23, based on the teachers' lists and after parent contact, students will engage in pull-out intervention for ELA with interventionist.

Teachers will conduct data chats with the identified students and use gradebook and formative/summative assessment data to gauge student comprehension.

Person Responsible: Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

By When: From 8/17/23 to 9/29/23, teachers will conduct data chats with the identified students and use gradebook and formative/summative assessment data to gauge student comprehension.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

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 PM3 data, 63% of 10th graders were proficient in ELA which is a decrease from last year when 66% were proficient. 77% of 9th graders were proficient which is a decrease from 83% from last year. 77% of 8th graders were proficient which is a decrease from 84% from last year. Based on the data and contributing factors such as student readiness levels, we will implement the targeted element of collaborative planning to address the instructional needs of lower performing students.

According to the 2022 – 2023 EOC Algebra data shows 84% proficiency. Even though there is an increase in the level of proficiency, there is room for improvement since Algebra showed a 4% growth from 80% to 84% while the other Mathematic content areas each showed double digit growth from 2022 to 2023. Based on this data and contributing factors such as student readiness levels, we will implement the targeted element of common planning to address the instructional needs of lower performing students.

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

With the implementation of intervention, 4% of the students in each grade level will show an increase in their ELA scores by the Spring 2024 F.A.S.T. assessment. 8th grade students will show an increase from 77% to 81%. 9th grade students will increase from 77% to 81%. 10th grade students will show an increase from 63% to 67%.

Algebra 1 scores will increase by an additional 4% for a total of 88% as shown by the Spring 2024 EOC.

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

Faculty will be provided support to meet and collaborate among departments and cross-curricular to share best practices. The School Leadership Team will monitor for the desired outcome by reviewing RSVPs, meeting notes, data- analysis, intervention frameworks, and lesson plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@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.)

Using collaborative data chats, we will engage in strategies for cross-curricular planning and planning within departments.

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

Collaborative Data Chats where teachers, support staff, and administration analyze student performance data and determine how that information will be used to drive future instruction (incorporation of virtual platforms can be utilized to encourage collaborative data chats).Time is also allotted to discuss activities and strategies teachers have used to remediate and/or enrich students on the assessed standards. Students who are in RtI or who are identified as fragile are also discussed. This ensures they are receiving the proper support. Data chats are also a time to discuss teacher needs as it relates to additional assistance needed in the classroom, and in what ways both administration and support staff can assist teachers with those needs."

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will share their availability to administration and administration will prepare a calendar for collaborative planning meetings to take place twice a month. Each teacher will RSVP for the meeting on Outlook.

Person Responsible: Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

By When: Between 8/17/23 and 9/29/23, teachers will share their availability with administration for the preparation of a collaborative planning calendar.

Teachers will have developed and completed a framework to guide collaborative meetings and shared with administration for approval.

Person Responsible: Marieyola Baptiste (mbaptiste@dadeschools.net)

By When: Between 8/17/23 and 9/29/23, teachers will have developed and completed a framework to guide collaborative meetings and shared with administration for approval.

Teachers will have completed two collaborative planning sessions and will have developed a short, medium, and long-term plan.

Person Responsible: Wendy Guzman (wguzman@dadeschools.net)

By When: Between 8/17/23 and 9/29/23, teachers will have completed two collaborative planning sessions and will have developed a short, medium, and long-term plan.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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

According to the 2022- 2023 Teacher Climate Survey, 77% of teachers responded neutral, disagree or strongly disagree that I feel frequently overloaded and overwhelmed by working at my school. Based on this data, we will include faculty and staff in recognition of performing well and promoting excellence. This will help our school continue to build a positive school culture centered around high expectations and supported by positive relationships among students, staff and stakeholders. We will implement the evidence-based strategy of Celebrating Successes to promote positive social and emotional well-being.

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

With the implementation of celebrating successes, we will see a decrease of the teachers responding neutral, disagree or strongly disagree that I feel frequently overloaded and overwhelmed by working at my school by 4% to 73% of teachers.

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

An administrator, two student leaders, a member of the PTSA, and a faculty member will form a committee to set guidelines for staff recognition and will execute the recognitions monthly. Student leaders and faculty members will rotate monthly to ensure all grade levels have opportunities to participate in teacher selection. During faulty meetings, the agenda will be set to reflect the recognition of the staff member.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Yoel Monzote (yoelmonzote@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.)

A school committee composed of stakeholders including teachers, students, administration, and parents will discuss and select a member of the staff to recognize monthly. Celebrating successes will increase motivation and a sense of achievement that will lead to a greater sense of individual and collective efficacy, and improve student efficacy.

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

Celebrate Successes is when staff and student accomplishments are given special recognition and achievements and are publicly celebrated allowing for encouragement from all stakeholders. Showing the connection between effort and achievement helps students to see the importance of effort and allows them to change their beliefs to emphasize it more. Recognition is more effective if it is contingent on achieving some specified standard.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

A school committee will be formed with an administrator, two student leaders, a member of the PTSA and the previous recognized faculty member. They will develop guidelines on how they will choose to recognize a member of the staff for their accomplishment for creating a positive and productive classroom environment over the month of August.

Person Responsible: Yoel Monzote (yoelmonzote@dadeschools.net)

By When: Between 8/17/23 and 9/29/23, the committee will meet and establish the guidelines for the upcoming year for the election of the teacher of the month.

A meeting with the committee will take place to decide on the staff member who will receive the recognition for the month of September. Nominations, based on the guidelines previously created by all stakeholders, will be made. Then, the committee will evaluate nominees and arrangements will be made to prepare recognition awards for the faculty member.

Person Responsible: Yoel Monzote (yoelmonzote@dadeschools.net)

By When: Between 8/17/23 and 9/29/23, the committee will select a faculty member to be recognized for their achievements for the teacher of the month.

By the next faculty meeting, the staff member will be recognized for their achievement and a description of their accomplishments toward student academic, social and/or emotional growth will be shared. A date for the next committee meeting will be set.

Person Responsible: Yoel Monzote (yoelmonzote@dadeschools.net)

By When: Between 8/17/23 and 9/29/23, the previously selected teacher will present the award to the recognized staff member at the faculty meeting.

#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.

According to the 2022- 2023 Student Climate Survey, 58% of students responded neutral, disagree or strongly disagree that my school cares about my social and emotional well-being. Based on this data, activities will be promoted that encourage growth mindset that will be supported by positive relationships among students, among staff and stakeholders. We will implement the evidence-based social and emotional programs and presentations promoting growth mindset.

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

With the implementation of a growth mindset, we will see a decrease of the students responding neutral, disagree or strongly disagree that my school cares about my social and emotional well-being by 4% to 54% of students.

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

The PLST, the SLT, the school counselor, and students services support team will help plan, implement, and assess a growth mindset program. The incorporation of school activities, student recognition plans, and surveys will help to monitor student social and emotional growth. The trust counselor will visit classrooms and faculty meetings to address the growth mindset school-wide.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Penelope Martinez (329517@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 area of positive school culture and environment, we will focus on the evidence-based intervention of growth mindset. Having a growth mindset will increase motivation and resiliency for students and teachers thereby increasing a sense of efficacy. This supports student and staff social and emotional growth and results in increased achievement over time.

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

Promoting Growth Mindset integrates growth mindset-oriented learning and practices. Promoting Growth Mindset can be displaying visible reminders of growth-mindset, facilitating activities that promote growth-mindset, and modeling growth mindset. By implementing programs to promote positive social and emotional well-being, students will feel better prepared and supported to tackle the rigor of the school.

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 Trust Counselor and teachers will discuss the growth mindset strategy and reflect on their classroom environment, student feedback methods, and the climate survey as they plan for the school year.

Person Responsible: Penelope Martinez (329517@dadeschools.net)

By When: Between 8/17/23 and 9/29/23, the Trust Counselor and teachers will discuss the growth mindset and reflect on their classroom environment to plan for the school year.

The Trust counselor and the Student Support Services team and student leaders will help to plan a school wide growth mindset program.

Person Responsible: Penelope Martinez (329517@dadeschools.net)

By When: Between 8/17/23 and 9/29/23, the Trust Counselor and the student support services team and student leaders will help to plan a school-wide growth mindset program.

The Trust Counselor and Student Support Services team and student leaders will help assess the program thus far and plan for further activities throughout the school day and faculty meetings. An in-house student survey will measure the impact of the program and suggest areas for improvement.

Person Responsible: Penelope Martinez (329517@dadeschools.net)

By When: Between 8/17/23 and 9/29/23, an in-house student survey will measure the impact of the program and suggest areas for improvement.

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: Intervention	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes