

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Downtown Doral Charter Elementary School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	9
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Downtown Doral Charter Elementary School

8390 NW 53RD ST, Doral, FL 33166

www.ddces.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	34%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	95%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Downtown Doral Charter Elementary School's mission is to provide our students with a comprehensive dual curriculum and bicultural/bilingual education through language acquisition and innovative programs, facilitated by a highly qualified staff promoting students' academic excellence creating future world leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Downtown Doral Charter Elementary School is Innovative Leaders Nurturing Passionate Global Leaders.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title
Acevedo-Isenberg, Jeannette	Other
Aguila, Joyce	Principal
Mathwich, Nakary	Teacher, K-12
Laks, Ana	Instructional Coach
Campos, Virginia	Teacher, K-12
Padilla, Vanessa	Teacher, K-12
Yano, Erika	Teacher, K-12
Ayo, Stefanie	Assistant Principal
Llera, Karla	Instructional Coach
Ortiz, Kimberly	Instructional Coach
Monteagudo, Ileana	Instructional Coach
Castro, Jacqueline	Teacher, K-12

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Jeannette Acevedo-Isenberg, Head of School: The Head of School provides a common vision and plan for the use of data-driven decision making and strategic planning.

Joyce Aguila, Principal: Works alongside the Head of School in providing a common vision and plan for the use of data-driven decision making, and strategic planning. The principal provides professional development and resources to support the dual language program and instructional programs.

Stefanie Vergara, Assistant Principal: Facilitates the effective implementation of the goals and objectives delineated by the principal. She ensures that the instructional programs are monitored and modified with efficacy while providing support for the total instructional and non-instructional staff.

Collaborates with RtI team in making data-driven decisions, supports the development and implementation of RtI, and works with students in the collaborative model.

Ana Laks, Portuguese Lead: Provides guidance and expertise in the delivery of the Portuguese language program and language standards.

Ileana Monteagudo, Spanish Lead: Provides guidance and expertise in the delivery of the Spanish language program and language standards.

Kimberly Ortiz, Reading Coach: Provides ELA support for teachers.

Karla Plata, Science Coach: Provides guidance and expertise with creating STEAM lessons and activities implemented in the classroom.

Grade Level Chairs: Participate in curriculum planning for core instructions; plan and collaborate with administration in identifying Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students and monitoring progress.

Ana Castellanos-Brand, Speech Pathologist: Assists in the selection of screening measures, identifies systematic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

Maria Rivas, Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plan, and provides technical assistance for problem solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation.

Additional Support:

Ana Mercado and Ennyluz Espinoza, Counselors: Provide counseling to students, organize RtI meetings, and provide behavioral support strategies for students demonstrating behavioral issues.

Ileana Kattengell, ESE Specialist: Provides instructional support to students within the ESE program and conducts IEP and EP meetings.

Cora Nusbaum, Natalia Novela, Raquel Serrano, Interventionists: Collaborate with classroom teachers and Assistant Principal in identifying and providing instructional interventions for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

Beatriz Pereira, ESOL Specialist: Collaborates with classroom teachers and Assistant Principal in providing instruction and offering assistance for all ESOL students.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	3	2	3	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	3	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	1	1	0	4	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	1	4	0	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected

Tuesday 9/18/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The data component which performed the lowest was 5th Grade's ELA proficiency score, with an 83%, a decrease from the students' 4th grade proficiency score. This is not a trend as the 2017-2018 school year was the first year the school provided 5th grade.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year is the learning gains of the lowest 25% in reading and math, specifically in math going from a 73% to a 59%.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The data component with the biggest gap when compared to the state average was ELA achievement, with a 31% difference.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The data component showing the most improvement was the 4th grade learning gains in ELA and in Mathematics, with 89% of students in 4th grade showing learning gains in ELA and 90% of students in 4th grade showing learning gain in Mathematics.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

The actions that led to the improvement in this area were the collaborative learning and structures implemented. The collaboration between the English and foreign language teachers was essential to the success of the students. The teachers used data to influence their instruction in both languages.

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	87%	62%	56%	85%	54%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	75%	62%	55%	0%	56%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	59%	48%	0%	52%	46%
Math Achievement	88%	69%	62%	85%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	72%	64%	59%	0%	60%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	55%	47%	0%	49%	46%
Science Achievement	71%	58%	55%	0%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	3 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	2 (1)	14 (1)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	7 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	4 (1)	1 (6)	17 (7)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	6 (2)	10 (5)	22 (7)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	83%	61%	22%	57%	26%
	2017	79%	58%	21%	58%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	90%	60%	30%	56%	34%
	2017	86%	57%	29%	56%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2018	83%	59%	24%	55%	28%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	92%	67%	25%	62%	30%
	2017	77%	65%	12%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	89%	68%	21%	62%	27%
	2017	91%	68%	23%	64%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2018	82%	66%	16%	61%	21%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	71%	56%	15%	55%	16%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	80										
ELL	79	76	68	85	83	70	59				
HSP	86	74	69	88	71	59	72				
WHT	100	91		94	80						
FRL	85	76	63	89	67	48	69				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
ELL	78	77	69	79	71	69					
HSP	86	71	74	87	81	71					
WHT	92			83							
FRL	86	63		81	79						

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Professional Development
Rationale	The Climate Survey showed the number of teachers who strongly agreed they felt stressed and overwhelmed at work increased from twenty-two teachers during the 2016-2017 school year to forty-three teachers during the 2017-2018 school year. As a result, professional development would allow the teachers to know how to use the various resources provided and when to use those resources to decrease the feeling of being overwhelmed.
Intended Outcome	The teachers will be kept up-to-date on new research on how children learn, effectively implementing tools available in the school, and the use of best practices with the curriculum resources based on students' needs.
Point Person	Kimberly Ortiz (ortizk@dadeschools.net)
Action Step	
Description	1. Professional development opportunities will be provided at the school site by teacher leaders and knowledgeable individuals in the focus areas. 2. Areas of Focus for PDs: Foreign Language, Differentiated Instruction, i-Ready, ELA
Person Responsible	Stefanie Ayo (svergara@dadeschools.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Effective implementation will be monitored by conducting walkthroughs during classroom instruction with a focus on the above mentioned PD opportunities. Classroom visitation logs will be kept and administrative feedback will be provided.
Person Responsible	Joyce Aguila (joyceaguila@dadeschools.net)

Activity #2	
Title	Differentiated Instruction
Rationale	After analyzing the 2017-2018 data, it was evident our students performed well when considering achievement, however the learning gain could have increased. Therefore, it is imperative for teachers to differentiate instruction for students based on the data. Making data-driven decisions will ensure all students' needs are being met.
Intended Outcome	The intended outcome is for teachers to differentiate instruction for their students based on the data gathered and provided to them. As a result, students will target their areas of weakness and strengthen their areas of strength, with the ultimate goal of increasing their scale score on the FSA.
Point Person	Stefanie Ayo (svergara@dadeschools.net)
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The administration will describe the new goal of incorporating differentiated instruction at the Opening of Schools meeting and provide professional development in the area of differentiated instruction. 2. Data chats will be conducted periodically using the data to inform instruction. 3. Weekly differentiated instruction day will be implemented across the grade levels. 4. Administration will conduct daily walkthroughs with immediate feedback on strategies used during DI.
Person Responsible	Stefanie Ayo (svergara@dadeschools.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Fidelity of implementation will be monitored through feedback provided by the principal, lead teacher, and teachers to ensure all needs are being met. Active participation and engagement from all parties through the action steps will be monitored. Classroom visitation logs will be completed, along with teacher observations.
Person Responsible	Joyce Aguila (joyceaguila@dadeschools.net)