J.C. Bermudez Doral Senior High School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

J.C. Bermudez Doral Senior High

5005 NW 112TH AVE, Doral, FL 33178

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Dade County School Board on 10/11/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of J.C. Bermudez Doral Senior High School is to journey together as a community of learners to assist every individual in becoming aware of their infinite worth and uniqueness. We educate using reason as a way of recognizing the meaning of truth and freedom.

Provide the school's vision statement.

J.C. Bermudez Doral Senior High School's vision is to educate individuals to become aware of their infinite worth and contribute to the good of society with their lives.

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
Iribar, Yanela	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Yanela Iribar oversees the Exceptional Student Education (ESE) department and ensures that students with disabilities are provided the necessary support in the standard or Access curriculum. She ensures compliance with district and state procedures within the school's ESE department. Ms. Iribar also collaborates with general education teachers to foster inclusivity and address individual student needs.
Robles, Claudia	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Robles teaches high school Language Arts and Journalism classes, catering to students with varying abilities and English Language Learners (ELL). As an educator, she employs blended learning techniques to enhance the reading comprehension abilities of all her students, ensuring their achievement in mastering the skills of reading, writing, and articulating various concepts and ideas found in classical texts and beyond.
Suarez, Sonie	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Suarez serves as a Language Arts teacher and plays an integral role in the Leadership Team. Her contributions encompass a wide array of responsibilities, such as overseeing master scheduling, coordinating testing, strategizing and executing professional development initiatives, providing instructional coaching, and delivering English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) instruction while ensuring compliance with relevant guidelines.
Smith, Katrisha	Assistant Principal	Ms. Smith assists in the planning, development, organization, coordination and supervision of all instructional programs and activities. She also interprets and implements the district-approved curriculum program in light of individual school needs. She maintains a commitment to ongoing growth in self and others, supporting and participating in district and site professional growth programs. Ms. Smith also establishes and maintains cooperative working relationships with community-based groups, parents, students, and District administrators and develops resources within the community.
Smith, Edward	Principal	Mr. Edward Smith is responsible for overseeing daily school operations, providing organizational leadership, managing the school budget, conducting interviews, and making hiring decisions for school personnel. Additionally, he handles the review and implementation of Miami-Dade County Public School (M-DCPS) policies. He also ensures a safe and clean environment for students, while also attending Professional Developments to stay abreast of current educational trends. Mr. Smith encourages, guides, and assists student leaders and teachers in reaching their fullest potential. He maintains an open line of communication by routinely meeting with teachers, parents, stakeholders, and community members to address their needs and concerns. Mr. Smith also supervises all academic areas and ensures student achievement remains the priority while consistently ensuring the school culture continues to grow positively.

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.

Meetings will convey with a diverse array of stakeholders, including school administrators, teachers and faculty, parents and guardians, students, community members, and guidance counselors and support staff. These engagements actively involved these key participants in informed decision-making during the planning and development of the process. Moreover, the invaluable insights garnered from the results of our 2022-2023 School Climate Survey were incorporated to further guide and inform the decision-making process throughout its entirety.

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))

J.C. Bermudez will regularly monitor our SIP through engaging in a continuous improvement cycle to design, implement, manage, and monitor efforts focused on providing opportunities and improving student achievement for all students. Such progress would entail making data collection decisions, evaluating and visually representing data, adjusting instructions, and communicating progress. We will determine what is working, what is not, and what is needed to improve our improve our academic standards and close the achievement gap. An action plan will then be developed and implemented with fidelity.

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
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	97%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	47%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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) 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: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	218
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	96
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	329
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	273
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	287

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	
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*	43	55	50	43	54	51	44		
ELA Learning Gains				46			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			42		
Math Achievement*	67	43	38	49	42	38	33		
Math Learning Gains				59			28		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			11		
Science Achievement*	84	62	64	52	41	40	81		
Social Studies Achievement*	59	69	66		56	48			
Middle School Acceleration					56	44			
Graduation Rate		89	89		56	61			
College and Career Acceleration		70	65		67	67			
ELP Progress	70	49	45	66			76		

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	323
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	413
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	35	Yes	2	
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	64			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	69			

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	67			

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	36	Yes	1	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	52			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	50			

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	43			67			84	59				70
SWD	23			35				48			3	
ELL	25			61			74	45			5	70
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	42			66			83	59			5	70
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	67			80				60			3	
FRL	47			63			96	57			5	74

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	43	46	40	49	59	58	52					66
SWD	28	33	28	35	49	35	41					
ELL	28	48	45	45	61	60	42					66
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	44	46	40	49	59	58	52					66
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	40	43		50	60		50					
FRL	41	44	38	46	57	60	48					69

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	44	46	42	33	28	11	81					76
SWD	19	35		21	28							
ELL	27	46	40	26	29	17	90					76
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	45	47	45	33	28	12	80					75
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	40											
FRL	44	45	43	29	31	14	78					72

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	41%	54%	-13%	50%	-9%
09	2023 - Spring	35%	51%	-16%	48%	-13%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	61%	56%	5%	50%	11%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	52%	21%	48%	25%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	65%	19%	63%	21%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	66%	-16%	63%	-13%

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 exhibited the lowest performance was observed in our school's overall performance in PM1 through PM3 for our F.A.S.T. Assessment in English Language Arts (ELA). This assessment resulted in a proficiency rate of 38% among our 9th and 10th-grade students. Possible contributing factors include an enrollment increase during the PM2 and PM3 assessments. Notably, a significant number of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) students exited the ESOL program during the administration of PM2. The frequency of testing administered throughout the year could also have influenced these results.

Another noteworthy data component that demonstrated subpar performance was within our U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) assessment. This particular assessment was introduced for the first time this year and yielded a proficiency rate of 50%. Further analysis uncovered contributing factors, including a noticeable lack of motivation and seriousness displayed by some of our students while taking the exam.

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

The data component that exhibited the greatest decline from the previous year was our ELA proficiency. The FAST Assessment results for the 2022-2023 school year indicated a proficiency rate of 38% among our 9th and 10th grade students, compared to 43% proficiency during the 2021-2022 school year. This decline can be attributed to several factors, including class size, an influx of new students enrolling during the PM 2 and PM 3 administration period of the exam, and the implementation of the new Florida's B.E.S.T Standards.

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 component with the most significant gap is in our ELA proficiency. For the 2022-2023 school year, we are 14 points below the 52% state average. The leadership team identified several contributing factors, including class size, a rise in enrollment during the PM 2 and PM3 administration window of the exam, and the integration of Florida's newly adopted B.E.S.T Standards.

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

The Geometry and Biology End-of-Course (EOC) assessments demonstrated remarkable improvements with proficiency rates of 71% and 84% respectively for the 2022-2023 school year. These gains were driven by targeted actions.

Professional development sessions focused on the BEST standards for Algebra 1 and Geometry equipped teachers with effective teaching strategies. Daily collaborative planning meetings within the math department enhanced instructional approaches through shared insights.

Weekly tutoring was provided to all students, supplemented by tailored interventions such as Spring and Winter break academies, Boot Camps, and Saturday Success sessions for Level 1 and Level 2 students in Math and Science. Technology-based interventions on platforms like IXL were integrated for daily practice.

Regular data chats, both quarterly with students and monthly within Department Meetings, ensured personalized feedback and data-driven instructional adjustments.

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

Our school has identified two areas of potential concern: ELA (English Language Arts) and U.S. History. To address these concerns, the leadership team has formulated a comprehensive action plan:

1. Offer In-House Professional Development.
2. Grouping Strategy for Student Support.
3. Vertical and Horizontal Planning Implementation.
4. Range of Support Programs- We will offer a variety of support programs, including push-in and pull-out interventions during regular class time, before and after-school tutoring sessions, as well as specialized academic support during breaks (Spring Break, Winter Break, Saturday Academy).
5. Data Monitoring and Hub Creation.
6. Incentivizing Progress for Students and Teachers: Recognizing and celebrating the gains made by both students and teachers is essential. We will implement incentive programs to motivate and acknowledge the hard work put forth by everyone involved.

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

J.C. Bermudez Doral Senior High School's highest priorities are:
1. Improving our ELA and U.S. History proficiency.
2. Prioritizing our students social and emotional well-being.
3. Bi-weekly administrative walkthroughs.
4. Vertical and Horizontal planning between ELA and U.S. History.
5. Collaborative planning that is data driven and strategic.

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.

After further review of our 2022-2023 FAST ELA data points, our leadership team has recognized the need for a heightened emphasis on standards-aligned instruction in ELA. This stems from our observation that student proficiency in ELA has declined from 43% in the 2021-2022 academic year to 38% in the 2022-2023 academic year, signifying a 5 percentage point decrease.

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

Successful implementation of Differentiated Instruction will result in a 3-percentage points increase in ELA proficiency as evidenced by 2024 state assessments. Administration will identify curriculum areas and specific concepts that students are performing below system/state level and examine school-based assessments and current interventions for students in high needs category.

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

The Leadership Team is committed to maintaining quality instruction through a comprehensive approach. Data chats will be conducted regularly, accompanied by follow-up walkthroughs to ensure instructional excellence. Bi-weekly lesson plans and data binders will be reviewed by administrators. Administrators will also perform routine walkthroughs to verify the alignment of vertical and horizontal content across all subject areas.

Monthly reviews of formative assessment data will be conducted to track progress. A collaborative process will be established between the Leadership Team and instructional staff to comprehensively analyze data. During Leadership Team meetings, data analysis will be a focal point to assess student growth on remediated standards.

The responsibility for monitoring and overseeing these initiatives will lie with the designated person or team, ensuring that students who aren't displaying growth receive extended learning opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Edward Smith (pr7641@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 Intervention of: Differentiated Instruction. Differentiated Instruction will assist with providing students with different avenues to learning and support their specific academic needs/levels. Data-Driven instruction will be monitored through the use of data trackers to drive instructional planning and data driven conversations to include OPMs.

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

Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of: acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability. Research demonstrates this method benefits a wide range of students.

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.

Starting on 8/22, teachers will develop and implement lesson plans which are aligned to the new F.A.S.T. standards and promote rigor. As a result of this action step, students will demonstrate engagement and critical thinking skills.

Person Responsible: Edward Smith (pr7641@dadeschools.net)

By When: (08/22/23-09/29/23)

Starting on 8/22, teachers will develop and utilize lesson plans which clearly delineate differentiated instruction. As a result of this action step, administrative walkthroughs should showcase strategic student groups utilizing a diversity of resources and working collaboratively.

Person Responsible: Katrisha Smith (katrishasmith@dadeschools.net)

By When: (08/22/23-09/29/23)

Starting 8/22, Grade level chairpersons will conduct monthly meetings to collaborate and ensure that student end-products are aligned to standards and that planned lessons embed remediation of weak standards while maintaining rigor and adherence to the district pacing guide.

Person Responsible: Edward Smith (pr7641@dadeschools.net)

By When: (08/22/23-09/29/23)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

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

After further review of our 2022-2023 U.S. History data, our leadership team discerned the imperative need for an enhanced emphasis on standards-aligned instruction in U.S. History. This arises from the fact that our students achieved a proficiency level of 50% on their U.S. History EOC, which notably falls below the District average of 66%.

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

Successful implementation of Differentiated Instruction will result in a 3-percentage points increase in our U.S. History EOC proficiency as evidenced by 2024 state assessments. Administration will identify curriculum areas and specific concepts that students are performing below system/state level and examine school-based assessments and current interventions for students in high needs category.

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

The Leadership Team is committed to maintaining quality instruction through a comprehensive approach. Data chats will be conducted regularly, accompanied by follow-up walkthroughs to ensure instructional excellence. Bi-weekly lesson plans and data binders will be reviewed by administrators. Administrators will also perform routine walkthroughs to verify the alignment of vertical and horizontal content across all subject areas.

Monthly reviews of formative assessment data will be conducted to track progress. A collaborative process will be established between the Leadership Team and instructional staff to comprehensively analyze data. During Leadership Team meetings, data analysis will be a focal point to assess student growth on remediated standards.

The responsibility for monitoring and overseeing these initiatives will lie with the designated person or team, ensuring that students who aren't displaying growth receive extended learning opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katrisha Smith (katrishasmith@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 Social Studies, our school will focus on the Evidence-based Intervention of: Differentiated Instruction. Differentiated Instruction will assist with providing students with different avenues to learning and support their specific academic needs/levels. Data-Driven instruction will be monitored through the use of data trackers to drive instructional planning and data driven conversations to include OPMs.

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

Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability. Research demonstrates this method benefits a wide range of students.

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.

Starting on 8/22, teachers will develop and implement lesson plans which are aligned to the U.S. History EOC standards and promote rigor. As a result of this action step, students will demonstrate engagement and critical thinking skills.

Person Responsible: Edward Smith (pr7641@dadeschools.net)

By When: (08/22/23-09/29/23)

Starting on 8/22, teachers will develop and utilize lesson plans which clearly delineate differentiated instruction. As a result of this action step, administrative walkthroughs should showcase strategic student groups utilizing a diversity of resources and working collaboratively.

Person Responsible: Katrisha Smith (katrishasmith@dadeschools.net)

By When: (08/22/23-09/29/23)

Starting 8/22, during vertical planning will take place between the ELA and Social Studies department. In our monthly grade level planning sessions, these departments will work together to guarantee that student outcomes are in harmony with standards. These sessions will also incorporate strategies for addressing any weaker standards, all the while upholding high standards of rigor and adhering to the district pacing guide.

Person Responsible: Edward Smith (pr7641@dadeschools.net)

By When: (08/22/23-09/29/23)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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 Florida B.E.S.T. Standards, the proficiency rate for the Students with Disabilities subgroup in ELA was 20%. In comparison, the 2021-2022 FSA proficiency rate for Students with Disabilities in was ELA was 28%, thus yielding an 8% percentage decrease in ELA. We will focus on Differentiated Instruction to address this critical need.

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

By effectively implementing differentiated instruction tailored to the subgroup of Students with Disabilities, we anticipate observing a 2 percentage point proficiency increase in their performance on the 2023-2024 FAST ELA Assessment.

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

During the scheduled progress monitoring assessments, our team will monitor the performance of the Students with Disabilities subgroup utilizing districts assessment tools, including Power BI, Performance Matters, and both PM1 and PM2 of the Fast Assessment. This particular subgroup will be at the center of our targeted extended learning initiatives, encompassing individually tailored before and after-school tutoring sessions crafted to accelerate their academic progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Edward Smith (pr7641@dadeschools.net)

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

The evidence based strategy that will be used is differentiated instruction. The use of differentiated instruction in the classroom will ensure students receive specific intervention support and will remediate their deficient skills to promote academic proficiency. Differentiated instruction will support teachers in meeting our students' academic needs.

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

Differentiated instruction is a researched based strategy that has proven to be effective in targeting student deficiencies. Differentiated instruction will ensure that teachers use qualitative and quantitative data to drive instruction that will meet students where they are.

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.

Starting on 8/22, teachers will begin crafting and executing lesson plans designed to align with the new F.A.S.T. standards and promote a high level of academic rigor. By specifically tailoring these lesson plans to accommodate the diverse learning needs of our students, including those with disabilities, we aim to foster engagement and cultivate critical thinking skills, ensuring that every student can excel and thrive in the learning environment.

Person Responsible: Katrisha Smith (katrishasmith@dadeschools.net)

By When: (08/22/23-09/29/23)

Starting on 8/22, teachers will embark on the process of meticulously crafting and implementing lesson plans that feature explicit differentiation strategies. These tailored lesson plans will not only cater to the diverse needs of all students but will also pay special attention to accommodating students with disabilities. The goal is to ensure that these students have access to appropriate support and instructional methods that align with their individualized education plans (IEPs) or accommodations.

Person Responsible: Katrisha Smith (katrishasmith@dadeschools.net)

By When: (08/22/23-09/29/23)

Beginning on 8/22, our instructional support team will conduct regular reviews of individualized education plans (IEPs) for students with disabilities. These reviews will be designed to ensure that each student's IEP is up-to-date, aligned with their current needs, and effectively supporting their academic progress. Any necessary adjustments or accommodations will be made in collaboration with teachers and parents, fostering a holistic and personalized approach to education for students with disabilities. This step will contribute to the continuous improvement of our inclusive education practices.

Person Responsible: Katrisha Smith (katrishasmith@dadeschools.net)

By When: (08/22/23-09/29/23)

#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 Climate Survey, it is noteworthy that 48% of the students who actively participated in the survey expressed some concerns about the school's dedication to their social and emotional well-being at J.C. Bermudez Doral Senior High School. This reflects a subtle one percent decrease from the previous year, where 49% of students reported feeling similarly supported during the 2021-2022 school year. This information prompts us to continue our efforts in enhancing and addressing the social and emotional aspects of our students' 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 Positive Behavioral Support Systems, our goal is to achieve a significant improvement, targeting a reduction of 10% in student responses indicating concerns about how the school supports their social and emotional well-being. This reduction will be quantified through the analysis of responses in the forthcoming School Climate Survey, marking a meaningful step toward enhancing our students' overall experience.

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

The administrative Team will work collaboratively our Mental Health Coordinator and School Counselors on planning activities and implementing district initiatives that promotes the social and emotional well being of all our students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katrisha Smith (katrishasmith@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.)

Positive Behavioral Support Systems provides school wide support systems with data based information. The Threat Assessment team, along with our Mental Health Coordinator will meet monthly to discuss student referrals and action steps that need to be implemented.

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

Based on the feedback from the student responses on the Climate Survey, the 2022-2023 data-based monitoring of student referrals will provide a data based indication as to the effectiveness of our school meeting the social and emotional needs of all of our students.

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.

Starting on 8/22, the Leadership team will collaboratively design and implement a holistic action plan informed by Mental Health Services guidelines and industry best practices. This plan will encompass regular mental health awareness campaigns, staff training, and student support systems. The overarching objective is to cultivate a caring, supportive, and nurturing school environment that prioritizes the well-being of both students and staff.

Person Responsible: Katrisha Smith (katrishasmith@dadeschools.net)

By When: (08/22/23-09/29/23)

Starting on 8/22, the ongoing monthly monitoring of student referrals, executed with a structured approach, will enable the Leadership Team to remain informed about the forthcoming action steps to be undertaken.

Person Responsible: Katrisha Smith (katrishasmith@dadeschools.net)

By When: (08/22/23-09/29/23)

Starting on 8/22, the Leadership Team will convene regular meetings to thoroughly assess and refine the Mental Health Initiatives outlined for our school, in collaboration with our Mental Health Coordinator and school counselors. We are committed to implementing this plan consistently and faithfully, with the primary goal of cultivating a secure and thriving social environment. This action step underscores our dedication to ongoing evaluation and adaptation, ensuring that any challenges or inefficiencies within our plan are promptly addressed for maximum effectiveness.

Person Responsible: Katrisha Smith (katrishasmith@dadeschools.net)

By When: (08/22/23-09/29/23)