



Pam Stewart, Commissioner

## 2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

---

Miami Northwestern Senior High

1100 NW 71ST ST

Miami, FL 33150

305-836-0991

<http://northwestern.dadeschools.net/>

## School Demographics

**School Type**  
High School

**Title I**  
Yes

**Free and Reduced Lunch Rate**  
89%

**Alternative/ESE Center**  
No

**Charter School**  
No

**Minority Rate**  
100%

## School Grades History

**2013-14**  
PENDING

**2012-13**  
A

**2011-12**  
B

**2010-11**  
B

**2009-10**  
D

## SIP Authority and Template

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

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, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Differentiated Accountability</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Part I: Current School Status</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Part II: Expected Improvements</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Goals Summary</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Goals Detail</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Action Plan for Improvement</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Part III: Coordination and Integration</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>48</b>

---

## 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. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. 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: Current School Status

---

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

### Part II: Expected Improvements

---

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

### Part III: Coordination and Integration

---

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

### Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

---

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

### Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

---

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

## Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

### DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

### DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
  - Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
  - Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
  - Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
  - Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
  - Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

### DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

### 2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Not in DA	N/A	N/A

  

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

## Current School Status

### School Information

#### School-Level Information

##### School

Miami Northwestern Senior High

##### Principal

Wallace Aristide

##### School Advisory Council chair

Tarvaneisha Hope

#### Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

Name	Title
Wallace Aristide	Principal
Nidia Ashby	Vice Principal
Kelly Austin	Assistant Principal
Ebony Edmonson	Assistant Principal
Manuel Ruiz	Assistant Principal
Vallet Tucker	Writing Coach
Hassel Rojas	Science Coach
Judith Gerena	Graduation Coach
Samuel Payne	Dean of Discipline
Tyra Tate	TRUST Specialist
Cheryl White-Lindsey	Testing Chair
Valinda Hayes	SPED Chair
Christina Lloyd	Student Services Chair
Tarvaneisha Hope	EESAC Chair
Stephanie Rolle	Math Coach
Andrea Titus	Reading Coach

#### District-Level Information

##### District

Dade

##### Superintendent

Mr. Alberto M Carvalho

##### Date of school board approval of SIP

12/11/2013

### School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

**Membership of the SAC**

Principal -1, UTD steward – 1, Teachers - 5, Parents – 5 , Educational Support- 1, Student – 1, BCR – 3. Alternate Principal – 1, Alternate Teacher – 1, Alternate Student – 1, Alternate Educational Support – 1; Alternate Parent- 1.

**Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP**

The SAC contributed to the development of the SIP by reviewing the strategies and ensuring all Professional Development opportunities were aligned to the strategies given by each content area.

**Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year**

The main activity that the School Advisory Council will undertake this year is to participate in the development, approval, and monitoring of the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. The SAC will also participate in the analysis and in the evaluation of data to determine the overall effectiveness of instructional strategies throughout the year. They will continue to participate in the development, approval, and monitoring of the School Improvement Plan as well as the required reviews. EESAC will agree by consensus to approve appropriate funding for programs and activities that support the School Improvement Plan as funds allow. If Miami Northwestern receives funds from the state's School Recognition Fund, EESAC will play an integral part in the overall distribution of those funds.

**Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project**

School improvement funds are expected to be allocated to projects that will enhance student achievement. Some of these projects include, but are not limited too, incentives for student achievement, school-based novel initiatives, and research based competition registration that promote critical thinking.

**Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC**

In Compliance

**If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements**

**Highly Qualified Staff**

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

**Administrators****# of administrators**

5

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is < 10)

**Administrator Information:**

**Wallace Aristide**

Principal

Years as Administrator: 9

Years at Current School: 4

**Credentials**

Degrees:

Bachelor of Science in Criminology

Masters of Science in Specific Learning Disabilities

Certifications:

Middle Grade Math

Educational Leadership

**Performance Record**

2013

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(Pending)

Rdg. Proficiency, 30%

Math Proficiency, 53%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 52%

Math Lrg. Gains, 72%

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 57% (-11 points)

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 71% (+2)

Rdg. AMO — 37%

Math AMO— 34%

2012

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(B)

Rdg. Proficiency, 27%

Math Proficiency, 33%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 52

Math Lrg. Gains, 54

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 63%

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 69%

Rdg. AMO — 30

Math AMO— 28

2011

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(B)

Rdg. Proficiency,

19%

Math Proficiency, 54%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 39 points

Math Lrg. Gains, 65 points

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 48 points

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 71 points

Rdg. AMO — 24

Math AMO— 21

2010

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(D)

Rdg. Proficiency, 19%

Math Proficiency, 55%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 37points

Math Lrg. Gains, 73 points

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 46 points

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 71 points

2009

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(F)



Rdg. Proficiency, 21%  
Math Proficiency, 52%  
Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 38points  
Math Lrg. Gains, 69 points  
Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 43 points  
Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 72 points

**Kelly Austin**

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 0

Years at Current School: 0

**Credentials**

Degrees:  
 Bachelor of Arts in English  
 Master of Education  
 Educational Leadership  
 Reading K-12  
 English 5-9  
 Certifications:  
 English  
 Reading  
 Middle Grade English

**Performance Record**

2013  
 ETO CSS  
 2012  
 ETO CSS  
 2011  
 Homestead Senior High School(C)  
 Rdg. Proficiency, 21%  
 Math Proficiency, 59%  
 Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 36 points  
 Math Lrg. Gains, 66 points  
 Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 47 points  
 Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 62 points  
 Rdg. AMO – \_\_25  
 Math AMO– \_\_23  
 2010  
 Miami South Dade Middle School (NA)  
 Rdg. Proficiency, 60%  
 Math Proficiency, 65%  
 Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 57points  
 Math Lrg. Gains, 61 points  
 Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 55%  
 Math Imp. of Lowest 62%  
 2009  
 Miami South Dade Middle School(B)  
 Rdg. Proficiency, 66%  
 Math Proficiency, 67%  
 Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 67points  
 Math Lrg. Gains, 67 points  
 Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 64 points  
 Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 69 point

**Ebony Edmonson**

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 3

Years at Current School: 9

**Credentials**

Degrees:

Bachelor of Science in Animal and Poultry Sciences

Master of Science in Food and Nutritional Sciences

Certifications:

Biology

Educational Leadership

**Performance Record**

2013

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(Pending)

Rdg. Proficiency, 30%

Math Proficiency, 53%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 52%

Math Lrg. Gains, 72%

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 57% (-11 points)

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 71% (+2)

Rdg. AMO — 37%

Math AMO— 34%

2012

Miami Carol City Senior High School (C)

Rdg. Proficiency, 23%

Math Proficiency, 32%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 52

Math Lrg. Gains, 44

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 62%

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 51%

Rdg. AMO — 29

Math AMO— 25

2011

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(B)

Rdg. Proficiency,

19%

Math Proficiency, 54%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 39 points

Math Lrg. Gains, 65 points

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 48 points

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 71 points

Rdg. AMO — 24

Math AMO— 21

2010

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(D)

Rdg. Proficiency, 19%

Math Proficiency, 55%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 37points

Math Lrg. Gains, 73 points

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 46 points

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 71 points

2009

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(F)

Rdg. Proficiency, 21%  
Math Proficiency, 52%  
Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 38points  
Math Lrg. Gains, 69 points  
Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 43 points  
Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 72 points

**Nidia Ashby**

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 8

Years at Current School: 2

**Credentials**

Degrees:

Bachelor of Science in Varying Exceptionalities

Master of Science in Educational Leadership

Certifications:

Varying Exceptionality

Educational Leadership

**Performance Record**

2013

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(Pending)

Rdg. Proficiency, 30%

Math Proficiency, 53%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 52%

Math Lrg. Gains, 72%

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 57% (-11 points)

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 71% (+2)

Rdg. AMO — 37%

Math AMO— 34%

2012

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(B)

Rdg. Proficiency, 27%

Math Proficiency, 33%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 52

Math Lrg. Gains, 54

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 63%

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 69%

Rdg. AMO — 30

Math AMO— 28

2011

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(B)

Rdg. Proficiency,

19%

Math Proficiency, 54%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 39 points

Math Lrg. Gains, 65 points

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 48 points

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 71 points

Rdg. AMO — 24

Math AMO— 21

2010

North Miami Senior High School (D)

Rdg. Proficiency, 21%

Math Proficiency, 55%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 38points

Math Lrg. Gains, 70 points

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 41 points

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 77 points

2009

North Miami Senior High School (D)

Rdg. Proficiency, 24%  
Math Proficiency, 56%  
Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 45 points  
Math Lrg. Gains, 73 points  
Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 54 points  
Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 77 points

**Manuel Ruiz**

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 9

Years at Current School: 2

**Credentials**

Degrees:

Bachelor of Science in Economics and Political Science

Master of Science in Educational Leadership

Certifications:

Social Science

Educational Leadership

**Performance Record**

2013

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(Pending)

Rdg. Proficiency, 30%

Math Proficiency, 53%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 52%

Math Lrg. Gains, 72%

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 57% (-11 points)

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 71% (+2)

Rdg. AMO — 37%

Math AMO— 34%

2012

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(B)

Rdg. Proficiency, 27%

Math Proficiency, 33%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 52

Math Lrg. Gains, 54

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 63%

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 69%

Rdg. AMO — 30

Math AMO— 28

2011

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(B)

Rdg. Proficiency,

19%

Math Proficiency, 54%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 39 points

Math Lrg. Gains, 65 points

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 48 points

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 71 points

Rdg. AMO — 24

Math AMO— 21

2010

Homestead Senior High School (D)

Rdg. Proficiency, 23%

Math Proficiency, 56%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 37points

Math Lrg. Gains, 71 points

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 34 points

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 73 points

2009

Homestead Senior High School (D)

Rdg. Proficiency, 22%  
 Math Proficiency, 51%  
 Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 41 points  
 Math Lrg. Gains, 70 points  
 Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 44 points  
 Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 66 points

## Instructional Coaches

### # of instructional coaches

5

### # receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

### Instructional Coach Information:

#### Tucker, Vallet

Full-time / School-based

Years as Coach: 0

Years at Current School: 3

#### Areas

Reading/Literacy

#### Credentials

Degrees:  
 Bachelors in English  
 Certification:  
 English 6-12

#### Performance Record

MAST Academy:  
 History of School Grades  
 2008-2009-A  
 Reading Proficiency:  
 2008-2009-88%  
 % Learning Gains  
 2008-2009- 75%  
 Miami Northwestern Senior High:  
 History of School Grades  
 2010-2011-B  
 2011-2012-B  
 2012-2013-B  
 Reading Proficiency:  
 2010-2011-B  
 2011-2012-B  
 2012-2013-B  
 % Learning Gains:  
 2010-2011-39%  
 2011-2012 52%  
 2012-2013-47%



Titus, Andrea		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 0	Years at Current School: 0
<b>Areas</b>	Reading/Literacy	
<b>Credentials</b>	Degree: Master's in Elementary Education Certifications: Reading Endorsement ESOL Endorsement	
<b>Performance Record</b>	Miramar High School: History of School Grades 2009-2010-B 2010-2011-A Reading Proficiency: 2009-2010-35% 2010-2011-41% % Learning Gains 2009-2010-42% 2010-2011-44% Miami Edison Senior High: History of School Grades 2011-2012-B 2012-2013-B Reading Proficiency: 2011-2012-22% 2012-2013-22% % Learning Gains: 2008-2009-52% 2009-2010-42% 2010-2011-41% 2011-2012-84% 2012-2013-71%	

Walden, Linda		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 2	Years at Current School:
<b>Areas</b>	Other	
<b>Credentials</b>	Bachelor of Science in Computer Science Master of Science in Business Administration	
<b>Performance Record</b>	2013 Miami Northwestern Senior High School(Pending) Rdg. Proficiency, 30% Math Proficiency, 53% Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 52% Math Lrg. Gains, 72% Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 57% (-11 points) Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 71% (+2) Rdg. AMO – __37% Math AMO– __34%	
	2012 Miami Northwestern Senior High School(B) Rdg. Proficiency, 27% Math Proficiency, 33% Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 52 Math Lrg. Gains, 54 Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 63% Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 69% Rdg. AMO – __30 Math AMO– __28	
<b>Performance Record</b>	2011 Miami Northwestern Senior High School(B) Rdg. Proficiency, 19% Math Proficiency, 54% Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 39 points Math Lrg. Gains, 65 points Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 48 points Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 71 points Rdg. AMO – __24 Math AMO– __21	
	2010 Miami Northwestern Senior High School(D) Rdg. Proficiency, 19% Math Proficiency, 55% Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 37points Math Lrg. Gains, 73 points Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 46 points Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 71 points	
<b>Performance Record</b>	2009 Miami Northwestern Senior High School(F) Rdg. Proficiency, 21% Math Proficiency, 52% Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 38points	

Math Lrg. Gains, 69 points  
Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 43 points  
Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 72 points

**Rolle, Stephanie**

Full-time / School-based

Years as Coach: 1

Years at Current School: 0

**Areas**

Mathematics

**Credentials**

Bachelor of Science in Mathematics

**Performance Record**

N/A as Instructional Coach was located at a private institution.

**Rojas, Hassel**

Full-time / School-based

Years as Coach: 2

Years at Current School: 4

**Areas**

Science

**Credentials**

Certification

Chemistry

Degree

Bachelor of Science

**Performance Record**

2013

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(Pending)

Rdg. Proficiency, 30%

Math Proficiency, 53%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 52%

Math Lrg. Gains, 72%

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 57% (-11 points)

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 71% (+2)

Rdg. AMO — 37%

Math AMO— 34%

2012

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(B)

Rdg. Proficiency, 27%

Math Proficiency, 33%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 52

Math Lrg. Gains, 54

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 63%

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 69%

Rdg. AMO — 30

Math AMO— 28

2011

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(B)

Rdg. Proficiency,

19%

Math Proficiency, 54%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 39 points

Math Lrg. Gains, 65 points

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 48 points

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 71 points

Rdg. AMO — 24

Math AMO— 21

2010

Miami Northwestern Senior High School(D)

Rdg. Proficiency, 19%

Math Proficiency, 55%

Rdg. Lrg. Gains, 37points

Math Lrg. Gains, 73 points

Rdg. Imp. of Lowest 25% - 46 points

Math Imp. of Lowest 25% - 71 points

**Classroom Teachers**

**# of classroom teachers**

113

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

113, 100%

**# Highly Qualified Teachers**

27%

**# certified in-field**

113, 100%

**# ESOL endorsed**

4, 4%

**# reading endorsed**

12, 11%

**# with advanced degrees**

36, 32%

**# National Board Certified**

2, 2%

**# first-year teachers**

19, 17%

**# with 1-5 years of experience**

34, 30%

**# with 6-14 years of experience**

42, 37%

**# with 15 or more years of experience**

18, 16%

**Education Paraprofessionals****# of paraprofessionals**

5

**# Highly Qualified**

5, 100%

**Other Instructional Personnel****# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above**

0

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is &lt; 10)

**Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies**

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

**Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible**

Knowing the importance of obtaining effective teachers, when recruiting and hiring new teachers, all administrators and the Instructional Coach(es) assigned to the content area are involved. The strategies utilized to retain teachers includes (1) providing targeted and data-driven Professional Development opportunities that will primarily focus on new and innovative instructional strategies, (2) providing common planning times within each content area, (3) facilitating a mentor/mentee program, and (4) facilitate workshops that allow teachers to provide feedback as it relates to issues in the school and utilize these times to include teachers in the decision making process of said items.

### **Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan**

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

#### **Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities**

All beginning teachers are paired with an experienced teacher with 3 or more years of teaching. This is an effective method of developing and retaining teachers. Mentors meet with mentees once a week and are assigned to a specific mentee. The purpose of the assignment is to assist the mentee along with transitioning in to the school-site. The goal is to assign mentees to mentors within their department to ensure effective delivery of instruction is taking place.

### **Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) / Response to Intervention (RtI)**

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

#### **Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs**

The RtI Leadership Team meets once per month. The principal provides the guidance and facilitation as well as directs the participants regarding the needs of the school. The RtI team will determine the projects and initiatives that are most important for the team to address and work with other school organizations and departments to ensure success. During the meetings, data are reviewed and will be linked to instructional decisions. Students will be identified as those who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks, etc. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

#### **Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP**

The RtI Leadership Team meets with the Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) and the principal to help develop the SIP. The team provides data on academic and social/emotional areas that need to be addressed; helps set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Results), facilitates the development of a systemic approach to teaching and aligns processes and procedures. Behavior modification processes are discussed with the RtI team as well as the EESAC members assists in the development of methods and avenues to address behavior matters.

#### **Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP**

To monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP the RtI Leadership Team along with EESAC reviews universal screening data and link it to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the

grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills.

**Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement**

- Reading baseline data and progress monitoring is managed through the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), FAIR, Hampton Brown-The Edge, Achieve 3000 (for ELL) and the Jamestown Reading Navigator.
- Mathematics baseline data and progress monitoring is managed through Edusoft.
- Science baseline data and progress monitoring is managed through Edusoft.
- Writing baseline data and progress monitoring is managed through Write Score.
- Mid-Year data: FAIR assessment, Achieve 3000, District Interim Assessment
- End-of-Year data: FAIR assessment, Achieve 3000, District Interim Assessment, Comprehensive English Language Learning
- Assessment (CELLA), and 2012 FCAT Results
- Snap Shots and Student Performance Indicators (SPI) are data tools used to analyze the students' cumulative and historical results in the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). Cognos is a data tool used to monitor student attendance and suspension. SWIS is a data tool used to monitor student suspension

**Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents**

Select members of the RtI team will be trained during the summer and early fall. Professional development sessions will be embedded during teachers' common planning time, department meetings and faculty meetings throughout the year. The RtI team will also evaluate additional staff PD needs during the month RtI Leadership Team meetings

**Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities**

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

**Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:**

**Strategy:** Before or After School Program

**Minutes added to school year:** 144

Tutorials take place four times a week by City Year Corps members in the areas of Math and Reading.

**Strategy Purpose(s)**

- Instruction in core academic subjects

**How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?**

Bi-weekly meetings are held with City Year for the purpose of analyzing academic data gathered on the students that attend tutorials regularly.

**Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?**

The individuals responsible for monitoring this data include Instructional Coaches as well as administrators.

**Strategy:** Before or After School Program

**Minutes added to school year:** 72

Research based instruction is delivered to assist students with scientific competition preparation. Activities within this program include, but are not limited to aquaponics, Fairchild projects, and Scimathalon preparation.

**Strategy Purpose(s)**

- Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education

**How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?**

Data is collected through the comprehension of skills needed to successfully complete competitions and activities many of the students must be involved in.

**Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?**

The individuals responsible for monitoring this data include Instructional Coaches as well as administrators.



**Strategy:** Weekend Program**Minutes added to school year:** 144

Students are able to come together and receive instruction on Saturdays within the core areas.

**Strategy Purpose(s)**

- Instruction in core academic subjects

**How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?**

Data is collected by assessments given at the end of the instruction.

**Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?**

The individuals responsible for monitoring this data include Instructional Coaches as well as administrators.

**Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)****Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
Aristide, Wallace	Principal
Ashby, Nidia	Vice Principal
Austin, Kelly	Assistant Principal
Edmonson, Ebony	Assistant Principal
Tucker, Vallet	Reading Coach
Titus, Andrea	Reading Coach
Rojas, Hassel	Science Coach
Gerena, Judith	Graduation Coach
Payne, Samuel	Dean of Discipline
Tate, Tyra	TRUST Counselor
White-Lindsey, Cheryl	Testing Chairperson
Hayes, Valinda	SPED Department Chairperson
Lloyd, Christina	SPED Chairperson
Hope, Tarvaneisha	EESAC Chair

**How the school-based LLT functions**

The LLT meets at least once a month. As educational leader, the principal aligns the school's culture and vision with the state's focus on literacy achievement. The principal guides the LLT in gathering, analyzing and interpreting school data, establishing goals based on the data, developing strategies to achieve the literacy goals, and measuring the success of the school literacy plan. Reading coaches support the implementation of the school literacy plan by providing teachers with school-wide literacy/instructional strategies, helping teachers analyze data for instructional decision-making, assisting teachers in differentiating instruction, suggesting appropriate resources, providing technical support to teachers, and

observing, providing feedback and modeling effective lessons. The LLT supports the implementation of the school literacy plan by establishing goals based on data, developing strategies to achieve the goals, establishing measures of success, supporting teachers in implementing literacy strategies, ensuring that literacy remains a priority, monitoring and reviewing the implementation of the school literacy plan.

### **Major initiatives of the LLT**

The major initiatives will involve reviewing progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting or exceeding benchmarks and students at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the LLT will identify professional development and resources needed to (1) enhance the academic performance of those students at moderate or high risk and (2) provide enrichment for students meeting or exceeding benchmarks. The LLT will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The LLT will further facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation. In addition, the LLT will oversee the implementation of the Accelerated Reader Program with sophomores and incoming freshmen, the opening of a Poetry Café, and the implementation of literacy blogs.

## **Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction**

### **How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student**

A School-wide Focus Calendar is distributed to each teacher and discussed at Common Planning. reading Coaches are available and frequent Common Planning sessions of core content areas that are expected to follow the Literacy Focus Calendar.

## **College and Career Readiness**

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I)(aa)-(cc), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

### **How the school incorporates applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future**

Miami Northwestern Senior High School applies and integrates courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future by:

- Incorporating the Academy and Small Learning Community (SLC) Model
- Selection of Academy by students in Grade 9
- Offering medical and performing arts magnet programs
- Increasing the amount of Dual Enrollment courses which allow students to explore subjects at the collegiate level
- Incorporating more academic content in vocational courses
- Vocational and core teachers plan together to enhance academic competencies in vocational programs
- Making the academic curriculum more vocationally relevant
- Providing college and career readiness programs and opportunities
- Encouraging students to participate in internships that relate to their course work.
- Implementation of College Summit, a career exploration curriculum, in 9th grade through freshman experience classes.

### **How the school promotes academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful**

Miami Northwestern Senior High School encourages students to be active participants in their own learning so that their course of study is personally meaningful and relevant. This is encouraged through:

- Selection of a 4 year course of study in an Academy
- Meeting with counselors to assist in course selection
- Placing students in internships with our business partners
- Increased use of technology to research careers
- "Career Fairs"
- Guest speakers
- E-Pep
- Academy Awareness Day

### **Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level**

Students in Miami-Dade county school district scores ten percent lower than the average in post-secondary readiness in comparison to other counties in Florida. Miami Northwestern is implementing the following strategies in increase the numbers of students testing above the college-level cut scores:

- 11th and 12th grade students are placed in an ACT/PERT test preparation course.
- Students are testing on designated dates to increase school wide participation
- Saturday school seminars in test preparation.
- Collaboration by all departments to increase school wide vocabulary

## Expected Improvements

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(A),(H), and (I), and 1115(c)(1)(A), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

### Area 1: Reading

**Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA**

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	37%	30%	No	43%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	37%	30%	No	43%
Hispanic	40%	40%	Yes	46%
White				
English language learners	23%	7%	No	30%
Students with disabilities	28%	13%	No	35%
Economically disadvantaged	36%	30%	No	42%

### Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	153	19%	30%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	75	9%	14%

### Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		21%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		70%

### Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	188	52%	57%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	206	57%	61%

**Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	24	62%	66%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		28%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	13	31%	38%

**Postsecondary Readiness**

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.	144	56%	60%

**Area 2: Writing**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	200	56%	60%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		0%

**Area 3: Mathematics****High School Mathematics****Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA**

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	34%	53%	Yes	41%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	33%	53%	Yes	40%
Hispanic	43%	56%	Yes	49%
White				
English language learners	55%	48%	No	60%
Students with disabilities	34%	26%	No	41%
Economically disadvantaged	34%	54%	Yes	41%

**Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		35%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		60%

**Learning Gains**

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (EOC and FAA)		72%	75%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (EOC)		71%	74%

**Postsecondary Readiness**

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.		25%	33%

**Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	126	35%	39%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	29	8%	10%

**Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	128	33%	37%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	62	16%	18%

**Area 4: Science****High School Science****Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		37%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		55%

**Biology I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	132	42%	44%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	80	25%	26%

**Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)****All Levels**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target
# of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs)	5		10
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	40	3%	25%

**High Schools**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses	120	5%	10%
Completion rate (%) for students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses		90%	95%
Students taking one or more advanced placement exams for STEM-related courses	0	0%	10%
CTE-STEM program concentrators	120		150
Students taking CTE-STEM industry certification exams	120	5%	10%
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE-STEM industry certification exams		90%	95%

**Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses	1200	75%	85%
Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more <i>accelerated</i> courses	500	30%	40%
Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> courses		10%	20%
Students taking CTE industry certification exams	512	95%	100%
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams		30%	40%
CTE program concentrators	400	25%	35%
CTE teachers holding appropriate industry certifications	11	84%	89%

## Area 8: Early Warning Systems

### High School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	379	23%	22%
Students in ninth grade with one or more absences within the first 20 days	21	5%	0%
Students in ninth grade who fail two or more courses in any subject	122	27%	26%
Students with grade point average less than 2.0	344	22%	21%
Students who fail to progress on-time to tenth grade	6	1%	1%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	647	40%	39%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	828	49%	48%

### Graduation

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students dropping out of school, as defined in s.1003.01(9), F.S.	50	3%	1%
Students graduating in 4 years, using criteria for the federal uniform graduation rate defined in the Code of Federal Regulations at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)	288	76%	78%
Academically at-risk students graduating in 4 years, as defined in Rule 6A-1.09981, F.A.C.	105	65%	67%
Students graduating in 5 years, using criteria defined at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)	315	66%	68%

## Area 9: Parent Involvement

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

### Parental involvement targets for the school

The parental involvement targets created for Miami Northwestern Senior High School include those targets that will increase student achievement by increasing student involvement in the school and in the community.



**Specific Parental Involvement Targets**

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Increasing PTSA membership	0	0%	5%
Increasing parental involvement during community activities	0	0%	10%

**Area 10: Additional Targets****Additional targets for the school****Specific Additional Targets**

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
--------	---------------	---------------	---------------

## Goals Summary

- G1.** According to the Winter Interim Assessment administered in Reading, 44% of students scored satisfactory which is 1% above our goal for the year. To maintain and exceed this expectation we will continue to promote school wide reading strategies.
- G2.** According to the Winter Interim Administered in 2014 in Writing, 69% of students scored proficient. This exceeds our goal for the year by 9%. Teachers will continue to teach elaboration and word choice skills to maintain or exceed performance.
- G3.** According to the Winter Interim administered in 2014 in Algebra, 40% of students achieved proficiency. This is 1% above our goal for the year. Teachers will continue to infuse Common Core Standards to maintain and exceed student performance.
- G4.** According to the Winter Interim administered in 2014 for Geometry, 18% of students scored proficiently. This is 38% below our goal for the year of 55%. Teachers will incorporate Two-Dimensional Geometry skills into lessons to improve student performance.

## Goals Detail

**G1.** According to the Winter Interim Assessment administered in Reading, 44% of students scored satisfactory which is 1% above our goal for the year. To maintain and exceed this expectation we will continue to promote school wide reading strategies.

**Targets Supported**

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)
- Writing
- Algebra 1 EOC
- Geometry EOC
- Social Studies
- U.S. History EOC
- Science - Biology 1 EOC
- STEM
- STEM - High School
- CTE
- EWS - Graduation

**Resources Available to Support the Goal**

- Instructional Reading Coach
- Instructional Writing Coach
- All content area teachers
- Leadership Team

**Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal**

- Students continue to struggle with reading comprehension.

**Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal**

Following the FCIM model, data from the prescribed intervention assessments will be analyzed regularly in order to monitor student progress, the effectiveness of program delivery, and to make adjustments to instruction when needed.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

MTSS/RTI

**Target Dates or Schedule:**

On-Going

**Evidence of Completion:**

Formative Assessments: District, school-site assessment, and intervention assessments (FAIR, Reading Plus, Achieve 3000) Summative Assessments: 2014 FCAT 2.0, 2014 Florida Alternate Assessment, 2014 CELLA

**G2.** According to the Winter Interim Administered in 2014 in Writing, 69% of students scored proficient. This exceeds our goal for the year by 9%. Teachers will continue to teach elaboration and word choice skills to maintain or exceed performance.

**Targets Supported**

- Writing

**Resources Available to Support the Goal**

- Teachers
- State's Exemplar Papers
- MDCPS Language Arts/Reading Website
- State's Holistic Scoring Rubric
- Writing Coach

**Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal**

- There is limited evidence that students have the skills necessary to effectively utilize elaboration techniques in their writing.

**Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal**

Follow the FCIM model using Interim Assessments and FCAT 2.0

**Person or Persons Responsible**

MTSS/RTI

**Target Dates or Schedule:**

On-going

**Evidence of Completion:**

Formative Assessments: District Baseline and Mid-year Writing Assessments, Summative: 2014 FCAT Writing Assessment.

**G3.** According to the Winter Interim administered in 2014 in Algebra, 40% of students achieved proficiency. This is 1% above our goal for the year. Teachers will continue to infuse Common Core Standards to maintain and exceed student performance.

**Targets Supported**

- Algebra 1 EOC

**Resources Available to Support the Goal**

- Algebra Project
- Math Teacher
- Math Coach

**Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal**

- Analysis of the Winter Interim assessment indicates a need for improvement in the area of Functions, Linear Equations, and inequalities. The deficiency is due to limited classroom opportunities to participate in and complete exploration and inquiry activities.

### Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Follow the FCIM model using Interim and End-of-Course Assessments

**Person or Persons Responsible**

MTSS/RTI

**Target Dates or Schedule:**

Quarterly

**Evidence of Completion:**

Formative: Gizmos, Florida Achieves, District and school-site assessment data, intervention assessments. Summative: 2014 End-of-Course Assessments.

**G4.** According to the Winter Interim administered in 2014 for Geometry, 18% of students scored proficiently. This is 38% below our goal for the year of 55%. Teachers will incorporate Two-Dimensional Geometry skills into lessons to improve student performance.

**Targets Supported**

- Geometry EOC

**Resources Available to Support the Goal**

- Carnegie Learning
- Teachers
- Mathematics Coach
- Pearson EOC Practice Assessments
- Related Professional Development

**Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal**

- Analysis of the 2014 Winter Assessment data indicates a need for improvement in the area of Three-Dimensional Geometry. Students demonstrate difficulty in being able to successfully complete problems involving perimeter and area of polygons.

### Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Follow the FCIM model using Interim and End-of-Course Assessments

**Person or Persons Responsible**

MTSS/RTI

**Target Dates or Schedule:**

On-going

**Evidence of Completion:**

Formative: Gizmos, Pearson Tutorials, District and school-site assessment data, intervention assessments. Summative: 2014 Geometry End-of-Course Assessments.

## Action Plan for Improvement

### Problem Solving Key

**G** = Goal

**B** = Barrier

**S** = Strategy

**G1.** According to the Winter Interim Assessment administered in Reading, 44% of students scored satisfactory which is 1% above our goal for the year. To maintain and exceed this expectation we will continue to promote school wide reading strategies.

**G1.B1** Students continue to struggle with reading comprehension.

**G1.B1.S1** Analyze and monitor student data using appropriate screening, diagnostic, progress monitoring, and outcome measures for both Reading, Writing, American History, and ELL and differentiate instruction to meet the various needs of students.

### Action Step 1

Create flexible student groups that are aligned to students' reading, writing, social studies, and limited English language proficiency needs conduct data chats, and build a structure that allows teachers to participate in collaborative planning sessions during and after school with the support of the instructional coach

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers

#### Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going

#### Evidence of Completion

Student work, Lesson Plans

### Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S1

Following the FCIM model, data from the prescribed intervention assessments will be analyzed regularly in order to monitor student progress, the effectiveness of program delivery, and to make adjustments to instruction when needed.

#### Person or Persons Responsible

MTSS/RTI

#### Target Dates or Schedule

ON-Going

#### Evidence of Completion

Lesson Plans, district and school-site assessments, intervention assessments

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

Following FCIM, data from the prescribed intervention programs and assessments will be analyzed regularly in order to monitor student progress, the effectiveness of program delivery, and make adjustments to instruction when needed.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Literacy Team

**Target Dates or Schedule**

On-Going

**Evidence of Completion**

District and school-site assessments, intervention assessments.

**G1.B1.S2** During instruction, students will evaluate the argument and specific claims within the text, assessing whether the reasoning is valid and the evidence is relevant and sufficient.

**Action Step 1**

Students will practice evaluating the argument and and specific claims within the text, assessing whether the reasoning is valid and the evidence is relevant and sufficient.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Teachers

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Weekly

**Evidence of Completion**

Student work, district and school-site assessments, intervention assessments.

### Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S2

Administrative Classroom walk-throughs and Lesson Plan reviews will be utilized in order to determine effectiveness of implemented strategies.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Leadership Team

**Target Dates or Schedule**

On-Going

**Evidence of Completion**

Lesson Plans, district and school-site assessments, intervention assessments

## **Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S2**

Following FCIM, data from the prescribed intervention programs and assessments will be analyzed regularly in order to monitor student progress, the effectiveness of program delivery, and make adjustments to instruction when needed.

### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Literacy Team

### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Weekly

### **Evidence of Completion**

District and school-site assessments, intervention assessments.

**G2.** According to the Winter Interim Administered in 2014 in Writing, 69% of students scored proficient. This exceeds our goal for the year by 9%. Teachers will continue to teach elaboration and word choice skills to maintain or exceed performance.

**G2.B1** There is limited evidence that students have the skills necessary to effectively utilize elaboration techniques in their writing.

**G2.B1.S1** Utilize the State's sample Exemplar Papers and/or other examples of good students' writing to demonstrate how details, elaboration, and proper word choice are to be used as support within their writing.

### **Action Step 1**

Students should practice the skills needed to incorporate details, elaboration and proper word choice into their writing. Teachers will utilize the State's Exemplar Papers to demonstrate how those skills are to be used as support within their writing.

### **Person or Persons Responsible**

10th grade Language Arts teachers

### **Target Dates or Schedule**

On-going

### **Evidence of Completion**

Writing samples will be reviewed regularly at department and grade level meetings. Turnitin.com reports will be reviewed, as well.



### **Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B1.S1**

Administrative Walk-Throughs and Lesson Plan reviews will be utilized in order to determine effectiveness of the implemented strategy.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Literacy Leadership Team

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

On-going

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Lesson Plans, district and site-generated assessments, turnitin.com reports, and student writing samples will be reviewed regularly at grade level/administrator Writing meetings

### **Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S1**

Following the FCIM model, data from writing samples collected from classwork and prescribed assessments will be analyzed regularly in order to monitor student progress, the effectiveness of program delivery, and to make adjustments to instruction when needed.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Literacy Leadership Team

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

On-going

#### **Evidence of Completion**

District, school and district assessments, and FCAT Writes.

**G2.B1.S2** Utilize data to develop differentiated lessons that focus on elaboration and address students' individual deficiencies through common planning.

#### **Action Step 1**

Teachers will continue to utilize data to develop differentiated lessons that focus on elaboration and address students' individual deficiencies through common planning.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

10th Grade Language Arts Teachers

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Weekly

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Sign-In sheet, lesson plans, data sheet review

### **Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B1.S2**

Review of student grouping and lesson plan reviews will be utilized in order to determine effectiveness of the implemented strategy.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Literacy Team

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

On-going

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Lesson Plans, district assessments, and student writing samples.

### **Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S2**

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

#### **Evidence of Completion**

**G3.** According to the Winter Interim administered in 2014 in Algebra, 40% of students achieved proficiency. This is 1% above our goal for the year. Teachers will continue to infuse Common Core Standards to maintain and exceed student performance.

**G3.B2** Analysis of the Winter Interim assessment indicates a need for improvement in the area of Functions, Linear Equations, and inequalities. The deficiency is due to limited classroom opportunities to participate in and complete exploration and inquiry activities.

**G3.B2.S1** Utilize warm-up exercises and reinforcement activities as a means to achieve mastery of Algebra 1 NGSSS and Common Core related standards dealing with Functions, Linear, Equations, and Inequalities and and Discrete Mathematics.

### **Action Step 1**

Students should be provided opportunities to practice content that allows them to reinforce concepts in the area of Functions, Linear Equations & Equalities.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Math Teachers

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Daily

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Student work, Lesson Plans

### **Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G3.B2.S1**

Administrative Classroom walk-throughs and Lesson Plan reviews will be utilized in order to determine effectiveness of implemented strategies.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Math Coach

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

On-Going

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Lesson plans, district and school-site assessment data

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G3.B2.S1

Following FCIM, data from the prescribed assessment and intervention programs will be analyzed regularly in order to monitor student progress, the effectiveness of program delivery, and make adjustments to instruction when needed.

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Leadership Team

#### Target Dates or Schedule

On-going

#### Evidence of Completion

District and school-site assessments, intervention assessments (Florida Achieves, Gizmos), Algebra 1 EOC.

**G4.** According to the Winter Interim administered in 2014 for Geometry, 18% of students scored proficiently. This is 38% below our goal for the year of 55%. Teachers will incorporate Two-Dimensional Geometry skills into lessons to improve student performance.

**G4.B1** Analysis of the 2014 Winter Assessment data indicates a need for improvement in the area of Three-Dimensional Geometry. Students demonstrate difficulty in being able to successfully complete problems involving perimeter and area of polygons.

**G4.B1.S1** Utilize Carnegie Learning and Pearson tutorials to reinforce geometric concepts identified on the Geometry EOC course descriptions. In doing so, teachers will provide students with practice in deriving the formulas for perimeter and/or area of polygons.

#### Action Step 1

Provide students opportunities to complete warm-up activities, classwork, and home-learning assignments that allow them to reinforce concepts involving perimeter and the area of polygons.

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Math Teachers

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Daily

#### Evidence of Completion

School work and assessments

### **Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G4.B1.S1**

Administrative Classroom walk-throughs and Lesson Plan reviews will be utilized in order to determine effectiveness of implemented strategies.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Math Coach and Leadership Team

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

On-going

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Lesson plans, district and school-site assessment data, intervention assessments (Pearson tutorials, Gizmos).

### **Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G4.B1.S1**

Following FCIM, data from the prescribed assessment and intervention programs will be analyzed regularly in order to monitor student progress, the effectiveness of program delivery, and make adjustments to instruction when needed.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Math Coach and Leadership Team

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

On-going

#### **Evidence of Completion**

District and school-site assessments, intervention assessments (Pearson tutorials, Gizmos), Geometry EOC.

## Coordination and Integration

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(J) and 1115(c)(1)(H), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

### How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Miami Northwestern Senior High provides services to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through extended learning opportunities (before-school and/or after-school programs, Saturday Academy or summer school). The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Support services are provided to students. Curriculum Coaches develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk;” assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Other components that are integrated into the school-wide program include an extensive Parental Program; Supplemental Educational Services; and special support services to special needs populations such as homeless and/or delinquent students.

## Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

*Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.*

**Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals**