Miami Arts Charter School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Miami Arts Charter School

95 NW 23RD ST, Miami, FL 33127

www.miamiartscharter.net

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.

Create and sustain an educational system of support that drives, encourages, and promotes academic excellence and competence through high expectations from students and teachers.
Achieve exceptional, observable results in the arts consistently reflected in student performances and inspiring creative work- individually and collaboratively.

Adopt and adhere to the highest standards to ensure physical safety, personal health, and emotional well-being.

Support and invest in teachers and other key adults in the pursuit of attaining the highest levels of competence, professionalism, ethical behavior, and professional growth possible.

Invite, encourage and enlist the support and cooperation of parents and caretakers to foster and solidify collaborative partnerships between home and school that will align to maximize student learning and personal growth outcomes.
Provide students and teachers a voice and sufficient creative space to achieve breakthroughs. Provide program opportunities for teachers and students to experiment with new approaches and share them collectively. To uplift each person every day and allow the joy, wonder, and excitement of learning new things to prevail within our culture.

Create opportunities for exploration that will inspire students to identify and establish long-term life goals and career pathways. We will work actively to develop and support relationships that provide students a connection to the world around them and a clear path to success and fulfillment beyond their years with us.
Strive for a culture of inclusiveness and work toward achieving the most significant reach, supporting our community's educational needs and impacting the greatest number of students while recognizing and sharing our students' and teachers' remarkable achievements.
Manage our financial and human resources responsibly to continually strengthen our economic condition and the stability of our school. Establishing and growing ongoing revenue and capital sources from local, state, and national sources to support the school's programs, hire the best staff, and continually improve technology.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We strive to be the school where students dare to dream. We promise to make sure no doors for students are ever closed. We value the privilege of our role in shaping the future leaders of tomorrow. Together, we will create an inspiring environment that sparks curiosity in all students while developing intellectually and creatively. Free thought will always be protected so that students may pursue their purpose in the world. We will ensure that students always have a path to success in all that they do because they deserve a life full of choice. Since learning is for life and life is about learning, our wish is for our name always to be synonymous with excellence.

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
Delarosa, Alfredo	Principal	School Principal oversees all school operations.
Delarosa, Christine	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal who oversees teacher training, support, mentoring and Professional Development
Torres, Carolina	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal in charge of curriculum and Student Services. Oversees the Master Schedule, course curriculum and student services.
Barreiro, Valerie	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for admissions and arts curriculum
Solorzano, Oscar	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Discipline and School Safety
Fernandez, Janelle	School Counselor	High School counselor and Mental Health Advisor
Molina, Juzmin	School Counselor	Middle School Counselor and Mental Health Advisor
Valdes, Annabelle	ELL Compliance Specialist	ESE/ELL Specialist
Esperon, Bryan	Graduation Coach	Provides Advanced Placement and College Advisement. English/ Language Arts Team Leader
leon, silvio	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Team Leader
Martinez, Oslia	Teacher, K-12	Mathematics Team Leader
Sanders, Justin	Teacher, K-12	Science Team Leader

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 completed individual sections and goal areas in response to data and with input from department chairs. Teachers, students, and SAC members will provide input following the return to school. SIP goals and action steps will be formed and adjusted based on input from each stakeholder group

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))

School/District and state assessments will be analyzed to ensure that progress is make in relationship to SIP goals. SIP goal teams and the school leadership team will meet regularly to review and revise action steps to ensure progress is made toward identified goals.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	77%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	2%
Charter School	Yes
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) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	18	25	49
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	3	3	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	9	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	49	65	140
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	58	68	163
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	21	39	47	107

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	4	16	24	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	6	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	23
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	24	126
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	37	32	78
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	

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	12	23	52	164

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	4	16	24	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	6	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	24	52
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	37	32	78
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	

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	12	23	52	87

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*	69	55	50	65	54	51	60		
ELA Learning Gains				57			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			33		
Math Achievement*	60	43	38	63	42	38	46		
Math Learning Gains				68			26		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			19		
Science Achievement*	61	62	64	52	41	40	57		
Social Studies Achievement*	90	69	66	89	56	48	82		
Middle School Acceleration	45			44	56	44	39		
Graduation Rate	86	89	89	88	56	61	91		
College and Career Acceleration	57	70	65	50	67	67	61		
ELP Progress	49	49	45	54			68		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	517
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	86

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	736
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	88

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	56			
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	59			
HSP	65			
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	63			

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	42			
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	56			
HSP	61			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	56			

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	69			60			61	90	45	86	57	49
SWD	38			20			38	88		50	6	
ELL	47			46			42	72	40		6	49
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	70			56			69	84	0	31	7	
HSP	67			58			58	90	51	61	8	51
MUL	73			80							2	
PAC												
WHT	74			64			61	94	44	56	7	
FRL	40									50	3	

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	65	57	48	63	68	58	52	89	44	88	50	54
SWD	33	46	42	32	52	44	22	68				
ELL	42	49	41	42	62	59	20	81	43	80	58	54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57	51	55	59	68	53	49	88	31	92	17	
HSP	62	57	49	60	68	56	51	88	43	86	53	55
MUL	86	73		75								
PAC												
WHT	72	59	46	72	71	71	53	91	52	91	52	
FRL	62	51	44	53	58	46	49	86	25	94	44	

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	60	44	33	46	26	19	57	82	39	91	61	68
SWD	25	33	21	19	26	19	33	61				
ELL	43	44	41	33	22	16	53	71	17	87	69	68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	49	39	29	42	31	29	49	67	35	95	48	
HSP	61	45	29	44	26	18	57	83	38	93	66	68
MUL	50	30		70								
PAC												
WHT	63	45	52	50	23	17	63	88	43	81	59	
FRL	62	42	35	43	22	16	48	78	20			

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	74%	54%	20%	50%	24%
07	2023 - Spring	65%	50%	15%	47%	18%
08	2023 - Spring	60%	51%	9%	47%	13%
09	2023 - Spring	73%	51%	22%	48%	25%
06	2023 - Spring	67%	50%	17%	47%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	56%	58%	-2%	54%	2%
07	2023 - Spring	58%	48%	10%	48%	10%
08	2023 - Spring	58%	59%	-1%	55%	3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	45%	40%	5%	44%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	56%	13%	50%	19%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	52%	17%	48%	21%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	65%	12%	63%	14%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	68%	20%	66%	22%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	66%	27%	63%	30%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Based on the 2022-2023 assessment data, Science showed the lowest proficiency from 52% in 2021-2022 to 45% proficiency in 2023-2024. This is due to the lack of teacher experience and teacher turn-over. Mathematics also declined from 63% in 2021-2022 to 57% in 2022-2023.

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

Science FSSA showed the greatest decline by 7% due to teacher vacancies and a lack of consistent monitoring of planning and teaching practices.

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.

Science achievement had the greatest gap with the State scoring 8% higher with 53%. Miami Arts Charter scored 45% proficiency. Teacher vacancies and a lack of consistent processes for planning, teaching, and monitoring student learning.

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

ELA Achievement improved from 65% to 68%

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

Attendance and levels 1/2 in Mathematics and ELA

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

1. Mathematics achievement
2. Consistent processes for PLC, lesson and unit planning and individualized support.
3. Graduation and acceleration

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 Science

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

Overall proficiency in Science is 45% as measured by the Spring 2023 Science assessment.

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

Overall proficiency in Science will increase to 60% as measured by the Spring 2024 Science assessment.

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

Administrators will communicate clear timelines and expectations with the science department leader and science teachers. Admin will collect bi-weekly feedback and data from the department and well as classroom visits. Unit assessments will be monitored and analyzed for standard mastery and growth

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Delarosa (cdelarosa@miamiartscharter.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.)

Purposeful science unit and lesson planning will focus in understanding standards and benchmarks.

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

Collaborative planning focused on standards-alignment and task selection will increase teacher effectiveness and consistency, student engagement and learning outcomes.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus