

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

North Park High School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	9
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	10

North Park High School

3400 NW 135TH ST, Opa Locka, FL 33054

<http://yourdiplomayourway.com/>

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)
High School 9-12	No	32%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	Yes	99%

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 North Park 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 North Park 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
Frater, Stacey	Principal
stephens, michael	Assistant Principal
Hilton, Michele	Administrative Support
greene, vanazza	SAC Member
Antuche, Romelia	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 members of the School Leadership Team meet initially at the start of the school year to reflect on the previous year's school-wide goals and set new performance goals for the year. Subsequently, the group meets weekly to review quantitative and qualitative data points to determine if goals are being met or if progress is made towards defined goals. Action plans are also developed and reviewed until desired goals are met.

As instructional leaders, the members are charged with developing and delivering professional development and serve as mentors for new teachers and new staff. In addition, the members are responsible for providing all staff with data points on students and overall school performance and assist with disaggregating that data.

All initiatives or action steps developed by the team is presented to staff in a weekly faculty meeting. These initiatives are usually in draft form and are never converted to actual next steps until all staff has an opportunity to review them and provide the team with feedback.

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	3	14	29	86	132	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	10	21	43	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	17	61	131	220	

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	

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

Date this data was collected

Tuesday 9/11/2018

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	19	60	79	163	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	47	79	148	

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	3	12	41	72	128	

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	19	60	79	163	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	47	79	148	

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	3	12	41	72	128	

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?

Student performance in Algebra I showed the lowest performance. This is a 18 percent decrease from the year before.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Algebra I proficiency showed the greatest decline from the prior year.

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

US History proficiency had the biggest gap when compared to the state average.

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

Proficiency in Biology showed the most improvement.

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

Increase focus on students focusing on note taking and the use of specific reading strategies to unlock complex text.

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%

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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	3 (5)	14 (19)	29 (60)	86 (79)	132 (163)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 (0)	9 (0)	10 (0)	21 (0)	43 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	11 (3)	17 (19)	61 (47)	131 (79)	220 (148)

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	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
	2017	0%	52%	-52%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2018	5%	54%	-49%	53%	-48%
	2017	4%	50%	-46%	50%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

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	3%	65%	-62%	65%	-62%
2017	0%	62%	-62%	63%	-63%
Compare		3%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	2%	67%	-65%	68%	-66%
2017	6%	65%	-59%	67%	-61%
Compare		-4%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	59%	-59%	62%	-62%
2017	18%	58%	-40%	60%	-42%
Compare		-18%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
2017	8%	48%	-40%	53%	-45%
Compare		-8%			

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
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

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 Increase proficiency in Algebra I

Rationale Algebra I proficiency decreased by 18 percent from the 2017 to the 2018 school year.

Intended Outcome During the 2018 - 2019 school year, student proficiency on the Algebra I EOC will increase from 0 percent to 5 percent.

Point Person michael stephens (michael.stephen@als-education.com)

Action Step

Description Principal and Assistant Principal will work with teachers to disaggregate student data and develop lessons that address student deficiencies in Algebra I.
Principal and Assistant Principal will provide job embedded professional development to teachers to assist with teaching the standards.

Person Responsible michael stephens (michael.stephen@als-education.com)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Principal and Assistant Principal will review math teachers and math interventionist lesson plans and student work samples.
Principal and Assistant Principal will review teacher interventions and progress monitoring documentation for students in Math classes.
Principal and Assistant Principal will conduct daily walk through of classes to observe the delivery of planned lessons.

Person Responsible michael stephens (michael.stephen@als-education.com)

Activity #2	
Title	Increase student attendance
Rationale	Students have exhibited poor attendance and that has negatively impacted their performance on state tests.
Intended Outcome	Student attendance will increase from 62 percent to 72 percent for the 2018-2019.
Point Person	Stacey Frater (953237@dadeschools.net)
Action Step	
Description	Principal and Assistant Principal will work with the school leadership team to review and address barriers that impede students from coming to school. The team will work to develop and implement an incentive plan for students and teachers to increase attendance. The team will collaborate with the Family Support Specialist and Career Coach to conduct home visits, mail letters and provide wrap around services for identified students.
Person Responsible	Stacey Frater (953237@dadeschools.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Principal and Assistant Principal will conduct weekly meetings with classroom teachers to review student and school wide attendance data. Principal and Assistant Principal will conduct weekly meetings with the school leadership team to review student and school wide attendance data
Person Responsible	Stacey Frater (953237@dadeschools.net)

Part V: Budget

Total:	\$0.00
---------------	---------------