

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Secondary Student Success Center 804



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	13
Budget to Support Goals	15

Secondary Student Success Center 804

7100 NW 17TH AVE, Miami, FL 33147

outreach.dadeschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Alberto Iber

Start Date for this Principal: 8/28/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative 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)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: F (0%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* 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	6
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	13
Budget to Support Goals	15

Secondary Student Success Center 804

7100 NW 17TH AVE, Miami, FL 33147

outreach.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)
High School 6-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year	2014-15	2013-14
Grade	F*	F

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.

Foster relationships with community partners in order to provide wrap-around services to successfully meet the diverse needs of EAOP students

Provide the school's vision statement.

We strive to foster relationships with community partners through innovation, opportunity and access to assist with eradicating the school to jail house pipeline, which is prevalent in our communities.

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
Clark, Theron	Principal	
Young, Tabitha	Assistant Principal	
Alonso, Nadeshka	Instructional Coach	
Baptiste, Belinda	Instructional Coach	Assist with the coordination and implementation of the Comprehensive Mathematics Plan, District Mathematics Curriculum, and Florida's Mathematics Standards.
Cancio, Leonardo	SAC Member	Instructs students, using various teaching methods, including lectures and demonstrations. EESAC Chairperson.
Gonzalez, Alejandro	Instructional Technology	
Lopez-Perez, Vivienne	Other	Serves as the Local Education Agency (LEA) representative for the Assistant Superintendent, Office of Special Education and Psychological Services.
Perez de Ayllon, Nidia	Administrative Support	
Campbell-McLemore, Mesha	Administrative Support	Assist with the coordination and implementation of the K-12 Comprehensive Researched-based Reading Plan.

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	

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	

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 8/28/2019

Prior Year - 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	5	11	20	5	6	4	7	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	0	1	2	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	4	3	1	8	24	26	3	3	3	4	79
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	9	13	17	38	48	10	20	12	10	194

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	12	14	11	20	50	76	31	27	30	67	338

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	20	5	6	4	7	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	0	1	2	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	4	3	1	8	24	26	3	3	3	4	79
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	9	13	17	38	48	10	20	12	10	194

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	12	14	11	20	50	76	31	27	30	67	338

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%	59%	56%	0%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	54%	51%	0%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	48%	42%	0%	45%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	54%	51%	0%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	52%	48%	0%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	51%	45%	0%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	68%	68%	0%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	76%	73%	0%	71%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (5)	0 (11)	0 (20)	0 (5)	0 (6)	0 (4)	0 (7)	0 (58)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	0 (3)	0 (4)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (2)	0 (0)	0 (11)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (8)	0 (24)	0 (26)	0 (3)	0 (3)	0 (3)	0 (4)	0 (71)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (17)	0 (38)	0 (48)	0 (10)	0 (20)	0 (12)	0 (10)	0 (155)

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
06	2019	0%	58%	-58%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	9%	56%	-47%	52%	-43%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	0%	58%	-58%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	9%	53%	-44%	54%	-45%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	8%	40%	-32%	46%	-38%
	2018	0%	38%	-38%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	8%	43%	-35%	48%	-40%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	73%	-73%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	72%	-72%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	18
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	90
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	87%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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 Reading data showed the lowest performance. Percentage of students making learning gains in Reading dropped from 33% to 4%. Percentage of students making learning gains in Mathematics dropped from 39% to 15%. Low student attendance and limited small group instruction has had an effect on student performance. The lack of implementation of best practices of data driven and differentiated instruction was also a contribution to the decrease of the learning gains.

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

Reading data showed the greatest decline from the prior year, dropping from 39% to 4%. Data driven and differentiated instruction were not implemented. Students' poor attendance also contributed to the decrease.

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 percentage of students making learning gains in the State for ELA is 59% compared to EAOP/ S3C students' percentage making learning gains for ELA is 4%. There is a gap of 55%.

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

Mathematics showed the most improvement from 39% to 50%. Small group and individual student instruction was conducted with fidelity.

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

1. 8th grade students attendance-Attendance below 90%-20%
2. 8th grade students scoring Level 1 on state assessments-48%

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

1. Percentage of students making learning gains in Reading and Mathematics
2. Daily Attendance
3. Percentage of students tested-90% or higher
4. Bi-weekly Progress monitoring
5. Increase social-emotional counseling with school psychologists

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

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.

Parent/Student interview prior to acceptance

Open house at each site

Teacher call parents as needed

Student take home monthly progress report

Parents have option of receiving weekly progress report by email

PFEF Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEF), 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.

EAOP has a team of full time-counselors who meet the needs of every student, often providing face to face contact on a weekly basis. Students are mentored daily by teachers on a one to one basis for academic needs and in small groups by teacher and subject area. School psychologists are also on call should a teacher observe the need and a school social worker works directly with teachers to provide home visitations and give aid to the family of students in need of food, utilities, and county services.

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

Following are the descriptors of transition:

No transition while in middle school

Transition initiated when credit recovery is completed:

- Home high school
- GED program
- Adult Ed. program

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.

To meet the needs of all students and maximize desired outcomes, members of the leadership team consistently review and discuss academic and behavioral data in order to determine effective strategies that are closely monitored for fidelity of implementation.

Title I, Part A

Services are provided 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 the schools, students, and families. School based, Title I funded Community Involvement Specialists (CIS), serve as bridge between the home and school through home visits, telephone calls, school site, and community parenting activities. The CIS schedules meetings and activities, encourage parents to support their child's education, provide materials, and encourage parental participation in the decision making processes at the school site. 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. Parents participate in the design of their school's Parent Involvement Plan (PIP – which is

provided in three languages at all schools), the school improvement process and the life of the school and the annual Title I Annual Parent Meeting at the beginning of the school year.

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

The S3C has established a partnership with the post-secondary education center whose campus the program is housed. This conveniently serves as an opportunity for students to tour the campus and learn about the programs offered. Additionally, guidance counselors meet with students individually to review their academic progress and discuss career goals and aspirations and provide them with the support needed to move forward.

Part V: Budget

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

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