

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Frederick R. Douglass Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Frederick R. Douglass Elementary

314 NW 12TH ST, Miami, FL 33136

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

Demographics

Principal: **Veronica Bello**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/7/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: I (%) 2017-18: I (%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: C (48%) 2014-15: D (33%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

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, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Frederick R. Douglass Elementary

314 NW 12TH ST, Miami, FL 33136

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	99%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	98%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	I	I	A	C

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.

Frederick Douglass Elementary School is a community of educators that provide a safe haven where children emerge with the confidence and desire to be life long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Frederick Douglass Elementary School's vision is to successfully build life-long learners who are responsible citizens of the global community. Frederick Douglass students, in collaboration with educators, parents, and the community, will develop motivated, self-reliant, creative, and ethical individuals who respect differences in others.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bello, Veronica	Principal	As the school's principal, Ms. Ellis provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. Data is utilized to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Ms. Ellis establishes high expectations for all students, and ensures that the school-based team is implementing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS).
Boynton, Terracish	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principal, Ms. Boynton works in collaboration with the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. She ensures fidelity of the MTSS monitoring by evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development with faculty needs.
Thompson, Karen	School Counselor	As the guidance counselor, Ms. Thompson is an integral part of the MTSS team that uses data-based problem-solving to integrate academic and behavioral instruction and intervention. She provides support to individuals and small groups of students.
Clinch, Ashley	Instructional Coach	As the reading coach, Ms. Clinch provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Ms. Clinch utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success.
Williams, Angel	Instructional Coach	As the math coach, Ms. Williams-Rumph provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Ms. Williams-Rumph utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	43	51	59	47	38	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286
Attendance below 90 percent	17	8	23	12	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	6	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Students with two or more indicators	1	2	0	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

16

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/29/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
-----------	-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-------

Attendance below 90 percent

One or more suspensions

Course failure in ELA or Math

Level 1 on statewide assessment

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
-----------	-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-------

Students with two or more indicators

Prior Year - 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	12	15	15	8	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
-----------------------------	----	----	----	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
-------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	1	1	7	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	62%	57%	44%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	62%	58%	55%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	58%	53%	79%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	0%	69%	63%	65%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	66%	62%	84%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	55%	51%	69%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	55%	53%	69%	52%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	43 (0)	51 (0)	59 (0)	47 (0)	38 (0)	48 (0)	286 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	17 ()	8 ()	23 ()	12 ()	4 ()	11 ()	75 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	5 ()	6 (0)	11 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	26 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (0)	13 (0)	8 (0)	33 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	28%	60%	-32%	58%	-30%
	2018	56%	61%	-5%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-28%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	24%	64%	-40%	58%	-34%
	2018	86%	60%	26%	56%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-62%				
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
05	2019	40%	60%	-20%	56%	-16%
	2018	14%	59%	-45%	55%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	67%	-22%	62%	-17%
	2018	53%	67%	-14%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	69%	-30%	64%	-25%
	2018	50%	68%	-18%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	40%	65%	-25%	60%	-20%
	2018	58%	66%	-8%	61%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	20%	53%	-33%	53%	-33%
	2018	28%	56%	-28%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
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
SWD	31	60		33							
ELL	45			64							
BLK	45	56	70	65	85		64				
HSP	42	53		63	80						

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
FRL	44	55	79	65	84	69	69				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	N/A
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance is science proficiency with 18%. The contributing factor was that additional professional development was needed in order to support the new instructional staff.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data component that showed the greatest decline is in ELA which showed that overall learning gains declined 34 percentage points. The major contributing factor was low student scores in the area of Integration of Knowledge. There was also a need to provide all ELA teachers with professional development that supports explicit instruction to meet the needs of all students.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is science proficiency with a difference of 18 percentage points. The contributing factor was that professional

development was required in order to support the new instructional staffs' knowledge and classroom management skills.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

According to our 2018-2019 data our FSA ELA 5th grade proficiency data was 4 percentage points higher as compared to the 2018-2019 data of all Tiered schools with similar demographics. The new actions our school took in this area include: implementation of coaching cycles, standard aligned instruction, and standards-based collaborative planning.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Reflecting on EWS truancy data, 26% of our students had 18 or more absences and the majority of these students are in accountability grades.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Increasing overall student proficiency in all subjects
2. Improving Attendance
3. Providing teachers with Professional Development to improve their content knowledge
4. Provide additional teacher support and resources
5. Increase learning gains in L25 and ELA and Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Differentiated Instruction This area of focus was selected based on the following reasons: According to the 2018-2019 FSA ELA data, 24% of the students showed adequate learning gains as compared to the 2017-2018 ELA where 58% of the students showed adequate learning gains, a 34% percentage point decrease.
Rationale	According to the 2018-2019 Math data, 47% of the students showed adequate learning gains as compared to the 2017-2018 Math where 31% of the students showed adequate learning gains, a 16% decrease. According to the 2018-2019 ELA data, 32% of the students were proficient as compared to the 2017-2018 ELA where 55% of the students were proficient, a 23% percentage point decrease.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Based on the above data, the area of focus is differentiated instruction. If we successfully implement differentiated instruction, then we will substantially increase students' learning gains and proficiency levels. Furthermore, if additional support is provided through systematic progress monitoring, then the percentage of students meeting high standards will continue to increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Veronica Bello (pr1361@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Data-Driven Decision Making
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to Mertler (2014), data-driven decision making refers to the process by which educators examine assessment data to identify student strengths and deficiencies and apply those findings to their practice. Data-driven decision making is a process embedded in the culture of the school where data is used at every entry level to make informed decisions on what is best for students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement a school-wide tracking system to assist with monitoring and analyzing student data to make instructional decisions. 2. Provide on-going professional development targeting instruction to enhance differentiated instruction. 3. Provide support to teachers in designing and developing instruction to meet student needs. 4. Conduct administrative-teacher and teacher-student data chats to analyze and reflect on student progress.
Person Responsible	Veronica Bello (pr1361@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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.

The faculty and staff at Frederick R. Douglass Elementary work rigorously to keep parents informed of their child's academic progress. Parents are provided quarterly progress reports, report cards and participate in parent/teacher conferences. We encourage our parents to volunteer and join the Parent Teacher Association. Additionally, all stakeholders are invited to attend our monthly Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) meetings in which they receive school improvement, data and budget updates, school program information, and other pertinent topics that directly impact student achievement. Parents are invited to school activities such as Open House, monthly 21st Century After school program meetings, and various events throughout the year.

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.

Students are provided with counseling service on an individual and group basis. Outside support agencies are made accessible to parents and students as needed. Our school has also partnered with several community organizations that provide one on one mentoring services to select students recommended by teachers and or parents. Students are screened for vision and hearing deficiencies and are referred to outside community agencies where they receive the resources needed to help them be successful.

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

Frederick Douglass Elementary has a mixed population of students ready for Kindergarten enrolling each academic year. Kindergarten instructors utilize Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener (FLKRS) to monitor student achievement and growth. The kindergarten screening assessments are used at the opening of school and closing of school to determine student growth. Data generated from the screening process is used to enhance instructional delivery for the academic school year. Additionally, fifth grade students participate in school visits to the feeder middle schools through the articulation process to explore opportunities to begin the middle school experience.

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 Education Transformation Office (ETO) utilizes funds to provide additional support to Frederick Douglass Elementary. Additional funds are used to purchase supplemental materials, to provide incentive pay, intervention and enrichment activities, job-embedded professional development, and targeted interventions and/or enrichment opportunities. Title I funding is utilized to acquire transformation coaches who have a history of positive student outcomes as teachers. The school receives additional teaching positions to reduce class size and provide additional courses, to address the needs of all students. Additionally, the school utilizes funds for during the day, before and/or after school, on Saturdays, and during Spring Break interventions.

The school’s leadership team analyzes all data sources during the Synergy Summer Institute to problem solve and identify essential practices to sustain and improve outcomes. The leadership team meets weekly to discuss the school improvement progress by analyzing student data and adjusts the action steps to adequately meet all students’ needs. Additionally, meetings are held to ensure all resources are being maximized and aligned to the progress of the school.

A Data Assessment and Technical Assistance Coordination of Management (DATA/COM) is conducted three times per year at the district level to gain a deeper understanding of the progress the school and make informed decisions that will improve student outcomes. The principal, Superintendent, state, and district personnel collaborate to problem solve and align resources to appropriately support the school. Strategic Planning Meetings are held three times per year for the ETO, Region personnel, and school-site leadership teams to reflect on the implementation of the defined structures and systems to ensure student success. ETO and region personnel analyze qualitative data and the implementation of the school’s action plan steps. This allows for collaboration with the school to ensure that all resources are being maximized to accelerate outcomes.

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Differentiated Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00