

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Green Springs High School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>11</b>

# Green Springs High School

3555 NW 7TH ST, Miami, FL 33125

www.greenspringshs.com

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2017-18 Title I School</b>	<b>2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	36%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	Yes	97%

## School Grades History

Year	2012-13	2011-12
Grade		

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade County School Board.

## 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.

The mission of Green Springs High School is to help at risk students earn a standard high school diploma and prepare for post secondary success.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Green Springs High School is to provide quality education to all students regardless of their life circumstances, recognizing that at risk students have different needs, learn at different rates, and have diverse learning styles which cause many of these at risk students to drop out of school.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

Name	Title
Palma, Enrique	Principal
Duncan, Cheryl	Other
Nunez, Maria	Assistant Principal
Cavanzo, Vivian	Teacher, K-12

#### Duties

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

The leadership team will use the school improvement plan to guide program implementation and student interventions. The plan will be shared with the school staff, the governing board, and the school advisory committee. The school improvement plan will serve as the framework for the plans sent by the Multi-Tiered support system (MTSS) Leadership Team. The goals and objectives outlined within the SIP will drive the efforts made by the MTSS Leadership Team to create academic improvements throughout the school.

### 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	31	49
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	27	34	66
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	66	161	237

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	67	119	194

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Date this data was collected**

Monday 9/17/2018

**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	0	0	0	0	5	10	42	127	184
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	25	36	67
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	160	167

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**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	0	0	0	0	5	10	42	127	184
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	25	36	67
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	160	167

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## 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?**

Due to the nature of our program, school data does not reflect on the School Data tab. Based on the SIR calculation for 2018 the school improved by 5 points in reading gains and 11 points in math gains.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

Based on the SIR calculation for 2018 there was no decline in reading gains or math gains from 2017 to 2018.

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

Math learning gains demonstrated the greatest gap when compared to state average.

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

Math gains showed the greatest increase based on the SIR calculation at 11 point gains from the prior year.

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

Increased focus on direct instruction in math preparation for the PERT and the Algebra 1 EOC.

**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	0%	59%	56%	0%	55%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	56%	53%	0%	50%	46%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	51%	44%	0%	46%	38%
Math Achievement	0%	51%	51%	0%	39%	43%
Math Learning Gains	0%	50%	48%	0%	39%	39%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	51%	45%	0%	40%	38%
Science Achievement	0%	65%	67%	0%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	73%	71%	0%	67%	69%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	1 (5)	3 (10)	14 (42)	31 (127)	49 (184)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (1)	5 (5)	27 (25)	34 (36)	66 (67)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	2 (2)	8 (2)	66 (3)	161 (160)	237 (167)

#### 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
09	2018	8%	54%	-46%	53%	-45%
	2017	0%	52%	-52%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2018	15%	54%	-39%	53%	-38%
	2017	8%	50%	-42%	50%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	22%	65%	-43%	65%	-43%
2017	23%	62%	-39%	63%	-40%
Compare		-1%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2017					
<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	41%	67%	-26%	68%	-27%
2017	35%	65%	-30%	67%	-32%
Compare		6%			
<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	8%	59%	-51%	62%	-54%
2017	0%	58%	-58%	60%	-60%
Compare		8%			
<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	11%	54%	-43%	56%	-45%
2017	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
Compare		11%			

### Subgroup Data

<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
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
<b>2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
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

### 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:



<b>Activity #1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Our first area of focus for the 2018-2019 school year is to increase student achievement across content areas of ELA, math, science and social studies.
<b>Rationale</b>	The typical Green Springs students is at least two grades behind cohort. In order to achieve the mission of the school, students must be able to recover credits from prior years and continue to earn credits towards graduation at an accelerated rate.
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	To increase student achievement to a 0.5 credit earning per enrollment rate.
<b>Point Person</b>	Enrique Palma (epalma@dadeschools.net)
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) The leadership team will assign courses to students based on their credit history and graduation requirements.</li><li>2) Teachers will communicate student progress on academic goals with school leadership every nine weeks and identify students who are not making adequate progress.</li><li>3) These students will be placed on academic plans with instructional supports to increase academic performance.</li><li>4) Academic plans will be reviewed with students by the leadership team with input from teachers to determine if adequate academic progress was achieved.</li><li>5) Teachers will inform parents as soon as student progress is less than expected.</li></ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Maria Nunez (mnunez@dadeschools.net)
<b>Plan to Monitor Effectiveness</b>	
<b>Description</b>	The Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school's academic goals through data gathering and analysis. In addition, the Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on credit completion data.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Enrique Palma (epalma@dadeschools.net)

## Activity #2

### Title

Our second area of focus for the 2018-2019 school year is to increase student achievement in state assessments for reading and math.

### Rationale

As part of the graduation requirements, students must pass the FSA/ELA and the Algebra 1 EOC or the concordant tests (ACT/SAT/PERT). The majority of students referred to Green Springs have not attained mastery in the state assessment for reading, math or both.

### Intended Outcome

Student gains in reading will increase from 59% to 61% as evidenced by the results from the FSA/ELA, and the ACT/SAT concordant tests reflected on the SIR calculation. Student gains in math will increase from 91% to 93% as evidenced by the results of the Algebra 1 EOC and the PERT concordant test reflected on the SIR calculation.

### Point Person

Enrique Palma (epalma@dadeschools.net)

## Action Step

### Description

- 1) Students who have not met the state requirement for reading will be identified and scheduled with an English teacher who will be delivering specific standards based instruction addressing the literacy components of the ELA.
- 2) Students meeting the above criteria not scheduled with an English teacher will receive the same remediation from the reading coach.
- 3) The literacy team will develop and update the instructional focus calendar for ELA based on the Florida Standards.
- 4) Students who have not passed the Algebra 1 EOC or the PERT will be pulled to receive instruction in math aimed at preparing students to take the PERT and the Algebra 1 EOC.

### Person Responsible

Maria Nunez (mnunez@dadeschools.net)

## Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

### Description

The Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school's state assessment goals through data gathering and analysis. In addition, the Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.

### Person Responsible

Enrique Palma (epalma@dadeschools.net)

**Activity #3**

**Title** Our third area of focus will be to improve YTD student attendance to 85% or higher

**Rationale** There are probably no factors more important to a student’s progress in school than regular and punctual attendance. Green Springs High School has a vision whereby each student engages in a rigorous course of study which prepares him/her for a myriad of successful post-secondary options

**Intended Outcome** Students will become aware of the importance of daily attendance and will maintain their YTD attendance at 85% or higher.

**Point Person** Enrique Palma (epalma@dadeschools.net)

**Action Step**

**Description**

1. Students who missed 10 or more days of school during the 2017-2018 school year will be placed on attendance contracts that specify that in order to receive credits withheld, student attendance must be 90% or better. Where possible these conferences will include the parents.
2. Daily attendance will be monitored and parents and students will be notified when absences become excessive (5 or more).
3. In accordance with MDCPS policy, students with 10 or more unexcused absences will have credits withheld pending improvement of the student's YTD attendance rate.
4. The school will complete and submit truancy packs for qualified students (15 or more unexcused absences within a 90 day period).

**Person Responsible** Candelaria Bozan (candelaria.bozan@als-education.com)

**Plan to Monitor Effectiveness**

**Description** The Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school’s attendance rate through daily, weekly, and monthly data gathering and analysis. In addition, the Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity the levels of support and interventions to students based on data.

**Person Responsible** Enrique Palma (epalma@dadeschools.net)

**Part V: Budget**

<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
---------------	---------------