

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Richmond Perrine Optimist



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 | 0 |

Richmond Perrine Optimist

18055 HOMESTEAD AVE, Miami, FL 33157

outreach.dadeschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Theron Clark

Start Date for this Principal: 8/16/2016

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Closed: 2021-08-11 |
| 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 | No |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 0% |
| 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 (8%) |
| 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 | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 15 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Richmond Perrine Optimist

18055 HOMESTEAD AVE, Miami, FL 33157

outreach.dadeschools.net

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 6-12</p> | <p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Alternative Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">%</p> |

School Grades History

| Year | 2014-15 | 2013-14 | 2012-13 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | F* | I | |

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.

Our mission is to 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 |
|------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Iber, Alberto | 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. |
| Nortelus, Joella | 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. |
| Lopez-Perez, Vivienne | Administrative Support | Collects and analyzes school-wide assessment data to design and implement progress monitoring tools to inform instructional decisions and practices. |
| Garrote, Rolando | School Counselor | Provides support to individuals and small groups of students using data-based problem-solving to integrate academic and behavioral instruction and intervention. |
| Perez de Ayllon, Nidia | Administrative Support | Collects and analyzes school-wide assessment data to design and implement progress monitoring tools to inform instructional decisions and practices. |
| Williams, Lance | Administrative Support | Collects and analyzes school-wide assessment data to design and implement progress monitoring tools to inform instructional decisions and practices. |
| Alonso, Nadeshka | 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. |
| 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. |

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 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 14 | 17 | 4 | 56 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 17 |
| 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 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 13 | 16 | 3 | 49 |

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 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 14 |

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)

3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/11/2019

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 | 4 (0) | 5 (0) | 5 (0) | 7 (0) | 14 (0) | 17 (0) | 4 (0) | 56 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 (5) | 3 (11) | 1 (20) | 1 (5) | 4 (6) | 5 (4) | 2 (7) | 17 (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 | 2 (17) | 4 (38) | 5 (48) | 6 (10) | 13 (20) | 16 (12) | 3 (10) | 49 (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 | 0% | 56% | -56% | 52% | -52% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 54% | -54% | 51% | -51% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 0% | 60% | -60% | 56% | -56% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 59% | -59% | 58% | -58% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 09 | 2019 | 0% | 55% | -55% | 55% | -55% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 54% | -54% | 53% | -53% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 0% | 53% | -53% | 53% | -53% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 54% | -54% | 53% | -53% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 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 | 0% | 53% | -53% | 54% | -54% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 52% | -52% | 54% | -54% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 0% | 40% | -40% | 46% | -46% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 38% | -38% | 45% | -45% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 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 | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | 0% | 65% | -65% | 65% | -65% |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | 0% | 72% | -72% | 71% | -71% |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | 6% | 67% | -61% | 68% | -62% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 63% | -63% | 61% | -61% |
| 2018 | 0% | 59% | -59% | 62% | -62% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 54% | -54% | 57% | -57% |
| 2018 | 0% | 54% | -54% | 56% | -56% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

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 |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | 10 | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | | | 8 | |
| 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 | 3 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 16 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 49% |
| 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 | 10 |
| 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 | 4 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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.

Reading and Math data components exemplified the lowest performance outcomes.

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

Reading exemplified the lowest performance outcomes. The absence of adequate personnel contributed greatly to the declination in this subject area.

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.

Reading exemplified the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The absence of adequate personnel contributed greatly to the declination in this subject area.

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

The Mathematics data component demonstrated a slightly better level of improvement. Additional tutoring through the support of Title I funding.

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

Attendance will improve by 15-20%
 Rigorous engagement with identified students in the Reading ELA Subject area.
 Rigorous engagement with identified students in the Mathematics EOC Subject area.
 Reduction in Suspensions and Behavior Interventions.

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

1. Attendance will improve by 15-20%
2. Rigorous engagement with identified students in the Reading ELA Subject area.
3. Rigorous engagement with identified students in the Mathematics EOC Subject area.
4. Reduction in Suspensions and Behavior Interventions.
5. Vet the potential students at a greater assessing process.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| | |
|---|---|
| #1 | |
| Title | Attendance |
| Rationale | Enhance attendance percentage by a minimum of 10% from the previous year of 2018-2019. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | 10% improvement in attendance |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Lance Williams (law1poise@gmail.com) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | RPO staff will address each student and parent during intake. All students and parents will be required to complete a truancy packet, regardless of status. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Overall comparison of attendance record for previous school year 2018-2019 will reflect a 10% increase in overall attendance |
| Action Step | |
| Description | 1. Administrator walk-through 2. Parent calls 3. Student data chats |
| Person Responsible | [no one identified] |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| #2 | |
| Title | Academics |
| Rationale | Enhance Academic profile by increasing EOC scores by 5 points in core subject areas; i.e. Reading, Writing, Math and Science on EOC exams score for at least 5% of the student population. |

| | |
|---|--|
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Academic profile by increasing EOC scores by 5 points in core subject areas; i.e. Reading, Writing, Math and Science on EOC exams score for at least 5% of the student population. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Lance Williams (law1poise@gmail.com) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Subject area teachers will make a concerted effort to address the individual needs of their students by implementing and executing weekend mandatory tutoring sessions along with the collaboration and support of the EAOP Reading Coach, Math coach, and any other additional support members. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | With the reflection of the Incompletion of Final scores. The Evidence-based Strategy rationale would be predicated on the scores. |

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve Attendance 2. Reduce Suspensions 3. Start Weekend Tutoring 4. Utilize Better Disciplinary Interventions 5. |
| Person Responsible | Lance Williams (law1poise@gmail.com) |

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 opportunities to request weekly progress reports.

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.

RPO 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 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.

The following strategies are used by RPO:

- Intervention early when students are developing their college and career aspirations.
- Emphasize rigor and high expectations for all students, along with appropriate counseling and supports.
- Integrate career based inquiry into content area classes.
- Collaborate with post-secondary instructions, economic development agencies and employers to help create smoother transition to college and the workforce.

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.

RPO has established a partnership with South Dade Technical College to provide students with the opportunity 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.