

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Hive Preparatory 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>10</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>12</b>

## Hive Preparatory School

5855 NW 171ST ST, Hialeah, FL 33015

[www.hiveprep.org](http://www.hiveprep.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)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	79%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	98%

### School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	A	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.

The mission of HIVE Preparatory School is to collaborate with stakeholders in creating a Highly Inquisitive Versatile Education that will facilitate a student-centered, adaptable learning environment. The School will provide students with a rigorous academic and social preparation that will promote dignity, courtesy, discipline, responsibility, and high expectations in order to achieve high academic standards and become productive citizens.

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

HIVE Preparatory School establishes the following goals in achieving its vision:

- 1.Create a safe, nurturing academic environment where all students will achieve high academic standards and professionals are empowered to embrace accountability.
- 2.Ensure students are exposed to a broad swath of cultural and academic experiences as preparation for success in a global economy.
- 3.Furnish adequate resources to achieve the School's mission including the recruitment and retention of highly qualified teachers and motivated staff.
- 4.Deliver an instructional system that will be tailored to individual learning styles including; differentiated instructions, active learning, and learning centers.
- 5.Serve students with disabilities according to their IEP.
- 6.Provide a flexible and versatile approach that will ensure continuous improvement of all learners.
- 7.Maintain an effective level of parental involvement.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

Name	Title
Gonzalez, Carlos	Principal
Zequeira, Jennifer	Assistant Principal
Bonilla, Sergio	Assistant Principal
Gonzalez, Alejandra	Teacher, ESE

#### Duties

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

Principal (Carlos Gonzalez): Plans, develops & provides effective instructional services to the school community within the framework of policies and state regulations.

Assistant Principal (Sergio Bonilla): directly involved with instructional services within the middle school grade levels.

Assistant Principal (Jennifer Zequeira): directly involved in the instructional services within the elementary school grade levels.

ESE Teacher (Christina Aleman): directly involved in the instructional services of all special education programs (IEP, 504, Gifted, etc..)

## 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	1	2	1	1	3	5	3	6	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	3	16	3	4	2	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	1	2	6	6	5	6	6	1	0	0	0	0	33

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	2	7	5	5	3	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	4	8	17	5	1	0	0	0	0	39

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	1	0	3	1	2	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	17

### 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	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	2	7	5	5	3	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	4	8	17	5	1	0	0	0	0	39

**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	1	0	3	1	2	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	17

## 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?**

Lowest 25% in Mathematics. Yes, it is a 3 year trend.

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

Mathematics learning gains (11 percentage points).

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

English-Language Arts (+20 percentage points).

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

Science achievement (7 percentage points). No.

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

8th grade science received a greater emphasis on small group and intervention work.

### 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	80%	62%	60%	67%	56%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	72%	61%	57%	58%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	57%	52%	49%	53%	49%
Math Achievement	78%	65%	61%	72%	59%	56%

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains	65%	61%	58%	58%	57%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	55%	52%	53%	49%	48%
Science Achievement	85%	57%	57%	76%	53%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	95%	79%	77%	90%	71%	72%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (1)	1 (0)	2 (1)	1 (0)	1 (0)	3 (1)	5 (0)	3 (0)	6 (0)	22 (3)
One or more suspensions	3 (2)	4 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)	3 (0)	1 (0)	11 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 (3)	3 (2)	16 (7)	3 (5)	4 (5)	2 (3)	11 (7)	5 (1)	0 (1)	45 (34)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	6 (4)	6 (4)	5 (8)	6 (17)	6 (5)	1 (1)	33 (39)

#### 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	80%	58%	22%	58%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	79%	60%	19%	56%	23%
	2017	76%	57%	19%	56%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2018	74%	59%	15%	55%	19%
	2017	67%	54%	13%	53%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
06	2018	76%	53%	23%	52%	24%
	2017	71%	53%	18%	52%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
07	2018	78%	54%	24%	51%	27%
	2017	87%	52%	35%	52%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2018	86%	59%	27%	58%	28%
	2017	81%	55%	26%	55%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	79%	67%	12%	62%	17%
	2017	85%	65%	20%	62%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	83%	68%	15%	62%	21%
	2017	84%	68%	16%	64%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2018	87%	66%	21%	61%	26%
	2017	78%	60%	18%	57%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2018	73%	56%	17%	52%	21%
	2017	75%	52%	23%	51%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
07	2018	70%	52%	18%	54%	16%
	2017	86%	49%	37%	53%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2018	27%	38%	-11%	45%	-18%
	2017	68%	39%	29%	46%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-41%				
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	81%	56%	25%	55%	26%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2018	72%	44%	28%	50%	22%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		72%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	65%	35%	65%	35%
2017	100%	62%	38%	63%	37%
Compare		0%			



CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	95%	72%	23%	71%	24%
2017	97%	69%	28%	69%	28%
Compare		-2%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	93%	59%	34%	62%	31%
2017	100%	58%	42%	60%	40%
Compare		-7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

### 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	21	44	43	37	56	58					
ELL	65	73	74	64	61	58		92			
BLK	78	69	75	74	60	43	88	100	90		
HSP	81	73	62	80	68	60	84	96	86		
WHT	83			50							
FRL	81	71	66	79	66	58	87	95	87		
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
SWD	22	53	58	47	50						
ELL	61	58	48	75	64	46	62				
BLK	74	63	61	80	78	42	69	100			
HSP	76	72	62	83	75	62	81	98	100		
WHT	91			64							
FRL	77	72	63	83	76	58	81	98	100		

### 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** Mathematics

**Rationale** The decrease in performance within each cohort (-5 percentage points) and the overall low scores in learning gains.

**Intended Outcome** Increase in 10 percentage points in mathematics learning gains and lowest 25% mathematics learning gains.

**Point Person** Carlos Gonzalez (gonzalez-carlos@dadeschools.net)

##### Action Step

**Description** Intensive math has been added to the schedules of all level 1 and 2 middle school students.  
Algebra B has been added to the schedule of all Algebra students.

**Person Responsible** Carlos Gonzalez (gonzalez-carlos@dadeschools.net)

##### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

**Description** Common planning was assigned to all math and intensive math teachers in middle school. Monthly meeting with the administration has been scheduled to monitor lesson planning and implementation. iReady Diagnostics and Topic Assessments have been scheduled for implementation and will be utilized to track student progress and to assist with intervention or curricular adjustments.

**Person Responsible** Carlos Gonzalez (gonzalez-carlos@dadeschools.net)

### Part IV: Title I Requirements

#### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

See Parental involvement Plan

#### PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

HIVE Prep embeds a strong focus on Character Education. Respect and responsibility are just two of the values at the heart of the School. The School community lives in an age where technology and social concerns dictate the need for a deepening concern for character. The basic principles for an integrated character education program will include, but not be limited to: the teacher as a caregiver, model and mentor; the classroom as a democratic community; activities that promote values and ethics; encouraging character reflection; discussion of issues and answers, problems and solutions; conflict resolution and students as mediators; parent and community involvement; character education task force comprised of teachers, administration, and parents.

The character education program is integrated through a mentoring program that contains activities that will help to determine how to appropriately infuse character attributes into all social-emotional situations in an effort to empower our students.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

HIVE Prep will continue to harbor relationships with local VPK programs by developing parent liaison committees and informational orientations regularly. HIVE Prep will participate in the College Bound Parents program: a program that provides information and assistance to incoming kindergarten parents throughout their K-12 years and will assess the incoming Kindergarten students using the FLKRS test as a baseline assessment as well as the CELLA test for the ELL students. Incoming students' social and emotional development will be assessed through the use of ECHOS. Data will be used to plan instruction and determine the need for interventions. Core academic and behavioral instruction is based on data and includes social skills instruction. Throughout the year the students' progression will be continually monitored through our iReady testing.

HIVE Prep hosts three high school transition meetings that prepare and support families as they prepare to apply and attend high school. The first meeting focuses on best practices on applying, comparing, and locating schools. The second meeting involves follow-up to the applications and site-visits. The final meeting is student-centered and how to prepare each child for high school requirements.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

The MTSS Leadership Team use the Tier 1 Problem Solving process to set Tier 1 goals, and monitors academic and behavioral data to evaluate progress towards those goals at least three times per year by: Holding regular team meetings where problem solving is the sole focus.

Using the four step problem solving process as the basis for goal setting, planning, and program evaluation during all team meetings that focus on increasing student achievement or behavioral success. Determining how we will know if students have made expected levels of progress towards proficiency? (What progress will show a positive response?)

Respond when grades, subject areas, classes, or individual students have not shown a positive response? (MTSS problem solving process and monitoring progress of instruction)

Responding when students are demonstrating a positive response or have met proficiency by raising goals or providing enrichment respectively.

Gather and analyze data at all Tiers to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by group or individual student diagnostic and progress monitoring assessment.

Ensure that students in need of intervention are actually receiving appropriate supplemental Tier 2

intervention. Gather ongoing progress monitoring (OPM) for all interventions and analyze that data using the Tier 2 problem solving process after each OPM.

#### Tier 2

The second level of support consists of supplemental instruction and interventions provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and behavioral supports to groups of targeted students who need additional instructional and/or behavioral support. Tier 2 problem solving meetings occur regularly (monthly is suggested) to:

Review OPM data for intervention groups to evaluate group and individual student response.

Support interventions where there is not an overall positive group response

Select students (see SST guidelines) for SST Tier 3 intervention

The school improvement plan (SIP) summarizes the school's academic and behavioral goals for the year and describes the school's plan to meet those goals. The specific supports and actions needed implement the SIP strategies are closely examined, planned, and monitored on the MTSS Tier 1 worksheets completed three times per year. The MTSS Problem-Solving process is used to first carry out, monitor, and adjust if necessary, the supports that are defined in the SIP. Annual goals are translated into progress monitoring (3 times per year) and ongoing progress monitoring measures (approximately once per month) that can reliably track progress on a schedule based on student need across Tiers. Tier 2 supports are provided to students who have not met proficiency or who are at risk of not meeting proficiency. Finally, MTSS End of Year Tier 1 problem solving evaluates the SIP efforts and dictates strategies for the next year's SIP. At this time, previous years trend data across grade levels is used to examine impact grades for support focus or prevention/early intervention efforts.

While the SIP plan does not focus on the primary (untested) grades, the MTSS leadership team extends the intent of the SIP to kindergarten, first, and second grades as they contribute extensively to later grades performance and student engagement.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

NA

### Part V: Budget

Total:	\$41,000.00
--------	-------------