

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Turner/Guilford/Knight

7000 NW 41ST ST, Miami, FL 33166

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Theron Clark

Start Date for this Principal: 12/3/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	15%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
	2018-19: No Grade
	2017-18: No Grade
School Grades History	2016-17: No Grade
······,	2015-16: No Grade
	2014-15: F (0%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information	n*
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, <u>click here</u> .

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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

	Turner/Guilford/Knight	
70	000 NW 41ST ST, Miami, FL 3316	6
	[no web address on file]	
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 7-12	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 Grade		2014-15 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 Educational Alternative Outreach Program (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
Iber, Alberto	Principal	Provide instructional leadership to faculty and staff to promote academic excellence, foster collaboration to support a positive school climate, and coordinate all school resources to ensure all stakeholders are equipped with the means to deliver quality educational programs to our students.
Nortelus, Joella	Instructional Coach	Provide assistance with the coordination and implementation of research- based instructional practices via the coaching model (planning, demonstrating, providing feedback) based on student need as determined by student assessment data.
Lopez- Perez, Vivienne	Administrative Support	Provides specialized knowledge and skills related to student-centered learning processes, techniques of assessment of learning and social adjustment, research design, and modification of behaviors to improve social and academic outcomes for students.
Alonso, Nadeshka	Administrative Support	Collects and analyzes school-wide assessment data to design and implement progress monitoring tools to inform instructional decisions and practices.
Shackelford, Latonya	Assistant Principal	Assists the Principal in providing instructional leadership to faculty and staff to promote academic excellence, foster collaboration to support a positive school climate, and coordinate all school resources to ensure all stakeholders are equipped with the means to deliver quality educational programs to our students.
Antonini, Enrique	Instructional Coach	Provides assistance with the coordination and implementation of research-based instructional practices via the coaching model (planning, demonstrating, providing feedback) based on student need as determined by student assessment data.
Perez de Ayllon, Nidia	Other	Provides specialized knowledge and skills related to student-centered learning processes, techniques of assessment of learning and social adjustment, research design, and modification of behaviors to improve social and academic outcomes for students.
Clark, Theron	Principal	Provides instructional leadership to faculty and staff to promote academic excellence, foster collaboration to support a positive school climate, and coordinate all school resources to ensure all stakeholders are equipped with the means to deliver quality educational programs to our students.
Young, Tabitha	Assistant Principal	Provides instructional leadership to faculty and staff to promote academic excellence, foster collaboration to support a positive school climate, and coordinate all school resources to ensure all stakeholders are equipped with the means to deliver quality educational programs to our students.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator		Grade Level														
indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total		
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						Gr	ade	e Le	vel	I				Total
indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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:

Indiantar						Gr	ade	e Le	ve	I				Total
Indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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)

2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/13/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level														
indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
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						G	rade	Lev	el					Total
indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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 ndicator K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12														
indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total					
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						G	rade	Lev	el					Total
indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOLAI
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).

Sabaal Grada Component		2019		2018			
School Grade Component	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									
Indiaator		Grade Le	evel (pri	or year r	eported)	Total		
Indicator	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total		
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (11)	0 (20)	0 (5)	0 (6)	0 (4)	0 (7)	0 (53)		
One or more suspensions	0 (3)	0 (4)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (2)	0 (0)	0 (10)		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (24)	0 (26)	0 (3)	0 (3)	0 (3)	0 (4)	0 (63)		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (38)	0 (48)	0 (10)	0 (20)	0 (12)	0 (10)	0 (138)		

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
07	2019	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	51%	-51%
Same Grade C	omparison	0%			•	
Cohort Com	parison					
08	2019	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	58%	-58%
Same Grade C	omparison	0%				
Cohort Com	parison	0%				
09	2019	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Same Grade C	omparison	0%				
Cohort Com	parison	0%				
10	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Same Grade C	omparison	0%				
Cohort Com	parison	0%				

MATH								
Grade Year		School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison		
07	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%		
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%		
Same Grade C	omparison	0%			· · ·			
Cohort Com	parison							
08	2019	0%	40%	-40%	46%	-46%		
	2018	0%	38%	-38%	45%	-45%		
Same Grade C	omparison	0%						
Cohort Com	parison	0%						

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

		BIOLO	GY EOC		
			School		School
Year	School	District	Minus	State	Minus
			District		State
2019	0%	68%	-68%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	65%	-65%
Co	ompare	0%			
		CIVIC	S EOC		
			School		School
Year	School	District	Minus	State	Minus
			District		State
2019	0%	73%	-73%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	72%	-72%	71%	-71%
Co	ompare	0%			
		HISTO	RY EOC	<u> </u>	
			School		School
Year	School	District	Minus	State	Minus
			District		State
2019	0%	71%	-71%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	67%	-67%	68%	-68%
Co	ompare	0%			
		ALGEB	RA EOC		
			School		School
Year	School	District	Minus	State	Minus
			District		State
2019	0%	63%	-63%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	59%	-59%	62%	-62%
Co	ompare	0%			
		GEOME	TRY EOC		
			School		School
Year	School	District	Minus	State	Minus
			District		State
2019	0%	54%	-54%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Co	ompare	0%			

Subgroup Data

		2019	SCHOO	DL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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
BLK											
		2018	SCHOO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	0
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	0
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
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	0
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - 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.

One hundred percent of students tested scored a level 1 on the ELA FSA. The factors that contributed to last year's low performance was the lack of structured progress monitoring and the inconsistent implementation of data-driven instruction to address students' academic deficiencies.

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

No data component showed a decline. From the prior year, 100% of students tested scored a level 1 on the ELA and Math FSA.

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.

Math achievement showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. 0% of students tested achieved proficiency compared to 58% of students in the state who scored a level 3 or higher. The factors that contributed to last year's low performance was the lack of structured progress monitoring and the inconsistent implementation of data-driven instruction to address students' academic deficiencies.

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

Science assessment results showed the most improvement. 90% of students scored a level 1 and 10% of students scored a level 2 as compared to the previous year in which 100% of students scored a level 1. Our school did not take new actions in this area.

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

NA- EWS not required

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

1. Gather baseline data on student performance and conduct data chats with students.

2. Analyze performance data and plan for differentiated instruction to address student academic deficiencies across all content areas.

3. Conduct formative assessments to monitor student progress.

4. Provide coaching support to teachers in the areas of data analysis, progress monitoring and planning for instruction.

5. Monitor the implementation of data-driven instruction and provide teachers with constructive feedback.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Academic Achievement: English Language Arts
Rationale	The percentage of students making learning gains in Reading increased from 36% to 40% from the 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we successfully implement differentiated, data-driven instruction then we will meet the needs of each individual student which will result in higher academic achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Latonya Shackelford (Ishackelford@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Data-Driven Instruction Based on Formative Assessments
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Formative assessment is "A planned process in which assessment-elicited evidence of students' status is used by teachers to adjust their ongoing instructional procedures or by students to adjust their current learning tactics" (Popham, 2008, p. 6).Research shows a trend of improved academic achievement when students are aware of and track their own progress (Marzano, 2017).
Action Step	
Description	 Teachers will conduct and maintain records of data chats with students utilizing FSA ELA data from the previous school year or results from a teacher-determined baseline assessment in the absence of 2018-2019 FSA ELA scores. Teachers will analyze performance data and plan for differentiated instruction to address student academic deficiencies related to reading comprehension. Teachers will conduct formative assessments to monitor student progress. Teachers will utilize data from formative assessments to conduct on-going data chats. Assistant Principal will monitor the implementation of data-driven instruction and provide teachers with constructive feedback.
Person Responsible	Latonya Shackelford (Ishackelford@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, § 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.

N/A

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.

TGK has a dedicated counselor who meets 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. Classroom teachers also infuse activities and lessons from the M-DCPS Values Matter Initiative to address students' social-emotional needs.

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

Miami-Dade County Public Schools partnered with the Juvenile Justice System as well as with several community partners to provide transitional services assisting adjudicated students in their transition back to appropriate educational settings. At one centralized location, students that have been released from adjudication by the Justice System are referred to the One Stop Center to receive an educational assessment by one of our transition specialists. Students will also have access to community service agencies for additional support. The following services are provided:

- · Comprehensive multi-disciplinary educational assessment and advisement;
- Referral to appropriate Miami-Dade County Public Schools support services;
- Transition advisement and placement in a K-12 or high school completion program;
- · Educational case management and academic progress monitoring;
- · Specialized services that utilize family and community interventions;

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 as well as provide in-class support to teachers with instructional practices appropriate to the setting.

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

Guidance counselors meet with students individually to review their academic progress and discuss career goals and aspirations. One Stop Centers also educates students and their parents about post-secondary opportunities.

Part V: Budget

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

III.A.	Areas of Focus: Academic Achievement: English Language Arts	\$0.00	
--------	---	--------	--

1

Total:	\$0.00	