

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Doctors Charter School Of Miami Shores



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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Doctors Charter School Of Miami Shores

11301 NW 5TH AVE, Miami Shores, FL 33168

www.doctorscharterschool.org

Demographics

Principal: Sherrell Hobbs

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	29%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (62%) 2014-15: A (69%)
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	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Doctors Charter School Of Miami Shores

11301 NW 5TH AVE, Miami Shores, FL 33168

www.doctorscharterschool.org

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	51%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	90%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

DCS Mission

A college preparatory school:

Empowering students to reach academic excellence and to embrace community service as global citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

DCS Vision

Inspiring students towards

D iscovery

C itizenship

S cholarship

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
Andrews, Kelly	Other	<p>Executive Director and Head of School</p> <p>The Executive Director performs responsible administrative and supervisory work in the area of the organization, from setting instruction goals and providing academic oversight, personnel, curriculum, budget, purchasing, public relations, plant operations, and all other daily operations of the organization. The Executive Director works to maintain the integrity of the organization as a place for high achieving students which incorporates a creative, hands-on education.</p>
Jackson, Edward	Principal	<p>High School Principal</p> <p>The High School Principal performs administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, personnel, curriculum and all the daily operations of the school. Works to maintain the integrity of the school as a place for high achieving students that incorporates multiple intelligences and a creative education.</p>
Garber, Doug	Principal	<p>Middle School Principal</p> <p>The Middle School Principal performs administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, personnel, curriculum and all the daily operations of the school. Works to maintain the integrity of the school as a place for high achieving students that incorporates multiple intelligences and a creative education.</p>
Marichal Santiago, Yesenia	Teacher, ESE	<p>Director of Student Services</p> <p>Responsible for the educational leadership of students placed in exceptional education programs, including gifted students and students with disabilities. The Director of ESE is expected to understand and demonstrate the use of the school's curriculum, student instruction and assessment to maximize educational achievement for all students; work collaboratively to ensure a working and learning climate for all students that is safe, secure and respectful. Implementing strategies to reach the multiple intelligences of students through creative lessons is required.</p>
Nikolaeva, Ekaterina	School Counselor	<p>High School Guidance Counselor/Director of Guidance</p> <p>The Director of Guidance provides a comprehensive school-counseling program that assists high school students in acquiring the skills and knowledge to maximize highest student achievement in a safe learning environment. The Director of Guidance will provide high school students with college preparatory counseling to include postsecondary planning in areas of college admissions applications, financial aid, and assessments.</p>
Washington, Phillip	School Counselor	<p>Middle School Guidance Counselor</p> <p>The Middle School Guidance Counselor will provide a comprehensive middle school-counseling program that assists all students in acquiring the skills and knowledge to maximize highest student achievement in a safe learning environment. Responsibilities may vary depending upon the specific work</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		setting with regard to counselor to student ratio and will correspond to the needs and priorities established in the schools counseling program.
Walker, Patty	SAC Member	EESAC Vice Chair Library Media Specialist
Dean, Edith	Registrar	Registrar The Registrar is a specialized clerical school operation support person registering students and managing a wide variety of student and curriculum information. The work involves responsibility for the day-to day maintenance and operation of the on-line information management system utilized for student registration, scheduling, curriculum planning, grade reporting and related activities.

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	86	90	88	95	94	54	74	581
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	13	16	9	8	8	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	5	1	5	0	1	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	6	10	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	7	6	7	8	0	50

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	8	14	13	4	1	7	9	56

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	2	1	2	4	18

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

32

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/6/2019

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	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	2	4	6	1	16	6	4	39	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	8	4	5	4	7	2	46	

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	19	13	19	14	9	13	4	91	

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	75%	59%	56%	74%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	54%	51%	60%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	48%	42%	50%	45%	41%
Math Achievement	78%	54%	51%	70%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	72%	52%	48%	60%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	51%	45%	50%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	79%	68%	68%	73%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	85%	76%	73%	81%	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	86 (0)	90 (0)	88 (0)	95 (0)	94 (0)	54 (0)	74 (0)	581 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	7 ()	7 ()	13 ()	16 ()	9 ()	8 ()	8 ()	68 (0)
One or more suspensions	5 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	18 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	6 (0)	10 (0)	24 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	9 (0)	13 (0)	7 (0)	6 (0)	7 (0)	8 (0)	0 (0)	50 (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
06	2019	74%	58%	16%	54%	20%
	2018	63%	53%	10%	52%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	67%	56%	11%	52%	15%
	2018	81%	54%	27%	51%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	83%	60%	23%	56%	27%
	2018	82%	59%	23%	58%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
09	2019	82%	55%	27%	55%	27%
	2018	75%	54%	21%	53%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	65%	53%	12%	53%	12%
	2018	74%	54%	20%	53%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	80%	58%	22%	55%	25%
	2018	64%	56%	8%	52%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	75%	53%	22%	54%	21%
	2018	74%	52%	22%	54%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
08	2019	82%	40%	42%	46%	36%
	2018	70%	38%	32%	45%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	64%	43%	21%	48%	16%
	2018	63%	44%	19%	50%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	93%	68%	25%	67%	26%
2018	88%	65%	23%	65%	23%
Compare		5%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	73%	10%	71%	12%
2018	90%	72%	18%	71%	19%
Compare		-7%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	87%	71%	16%	70%	17%
2018	85%	67%	18%	68%	17%
Compare		2%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	63%	29%	61%	31%
2018	79%	59%	20%	62%	17%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		13%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	54%	4%	57%	1%
2018	71%	54%	17%	56%	15%
Compare		-13%			

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
SWD	33	38	45	29	27	36					
ELL	61	55	40	67	56	57	57	61			
ASN	100	60		80							
BLK	68	60	54	73	66	60	73	81	24	100	46
HSP	84	67	57	88	85	86	89	90	11	95	57
WHT	80	62		85	72		85	94		100	27
FRL	69	61	62	74	65	60	75	87	16	100	50
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
SWD	31	60		25	58	64					
ELL	39	68	64	38	44			70			
ASN	75	45		82	70						
BLK	68	61	57	64	55	66	71	86	30	100	25
HSP	83	70	57	81	64	75	84	94	44	100	56
WHT	89	78	73	80	67		74	67			
FRL	63	56	36	61	56	82	71	87		100	38
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	20										
ELL	35	44	47	39	48						
ASN	100	100		79	67						
BLK	70	56	50	64	59	51	71	80	29	97	35
HSP	79	61	50	78	58	58	78	81	58	100	53
WHT	74	65	45	75	64	40	71	83	61		
FRL										95	32

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
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	741
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	64
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	74
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	76
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	65
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

Students with Disabilities. In 2018-19 twenty-one students were identified as students with special needs. The four seniors earned concordant scores to achieve graduation status. Of the remaining 17 students, 7 students passed one section of Math or ELA, while only one student passed both sections. It is noted that there was a small gain in achievement within this group from 2018 to 2019, however it appears that the contributing factors to this low performance include a lower level of vertical and horizontal collaboration among teachers to support students with disabilities, lower levels of differentiated instruction within the classrooms, and that all students with disabilities receive only consultation services with follow up by the Student Services staff. Four of the 21 students (19%) had less than 90% attendance.

Trends that contribute to lower performance include that ELA Achievement flatlined at 75% from 18-19, ELA learning gains decreased by 3%, and the pass rate in the ELA Lowest 25% decreased by 6%. While math achievement and math learning gains were up 7% and 12% respectively, the Math Lowest 25% decreased 4%. It is noted that many of the DCS students with disabilities fall within these categories contributing to lower performance.

In addition, it is noted that students with disabilities as well as students with academic deficiencies are among the number of students listed with 2 or more early warning signs and students with course failures in ELA and Math. While this number decreased from 2018-2019, these are contributing factors to lower performance.

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

Students in Grade 10 ELA and Geometry EOC showed the greatest decline from the prior year respectively. ELA Grade 10 in the same grade comparison decreased by 9% and the cohort decreased by 10% from the previous year. Additionally, students in grade 10 taking the Geometry EOC saw a same grade decrease of 13%.

Factors contributing to these statistics include a lower level of fidelity in math instruction during these students' middle school years to provide a foundation of mathematics and a higher than normal turnover of math instructors during that time period contributing to poorer performance in geometry. While intensive math elective courses have been offered to support students, this support has been insufficient for this cohort of students and their success.

This cohort of students in ELA performed at 75% in 2018 and decreased to 65% in 2019, a 10% decline. A large number of this cohort were placed in an intensive reading elective during both their 9th and 10th grade years indicating a level 1 or 2 performance. Additionally, only 33% of grade 10 students taking Intensive Reading were identified as on grade level according to Lexile range early in the school year via the NWEA formative assessment. Furthermore, this formative assessment NWEA also indicated for this grade level, a decline in growth from fall to winter of 10% in 2018-2019.

Lower levels of vertical and horizontal collaboration among teachers and lower levels of differentiated instruction within the classrooms contribute to lower performance among students in this cohort.

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.

DCS is above the State and District average in every category. The greatest gap is noted in grade 8 math with a +42% above the district and a +36% above the state. This gap of success may be due to a restructure of the math department over the last two years utilizing a looping strategy as well as being fortunate to having highly effective teachers as a focus to math instruction overall. Utilizing Imagine Math with fidelity as an intervention tool and NWEA as a formative assessment tool has assisted the math department in utilizing data to drive instruction.

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

The most improvement was made in Algebra 1 at 31% above the State average and an increase of 13% in the grade level cohort. The math department at DCS has been fortunate to begin a looping strategy of highly effective teachers to provide consistency in teaching and support to all students. The increase in grade 8 math of 12% in the same grade cohort as well as 8% increase in the cohort comparison has provided a state of stability within the math department. An academically challenged

grade 7 cohort also made an 11% gain with the looping strategy employed.

Strategically providing an elementary trained 6th grade math teacher to provide for the transition from elementary to middle school math and then providing a looping model of teaching in grades 7, 8, and 9, DCS is attempting to build a firmer foundation for high school mathematics and middle school student success.

DCS has also strategically included grade level intensive electives in mathematics for grades 6-9 to strengthen the lower 25% of each cohort.

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

While there was a drop in the number of students with 2 or more warning indicators, the number of students earning a level 1 on one or more of the state assessments jumps out as a concern. As indicated previously, the teams have identified potential concerns regarding a lower level of vertical and horizontal collaboration among teachers and a lower level of differentiated instruction within the classroom as potential factors contributing to the lack of student success. With 50 students identified (with most in the middle school), this continues to be an area of concern and focus.

Overall DCS attendance saw a small decrease in 2018-19 with 68 students (more than 11% of the student population) identified as having 10 or more absences. While DCS attendance continues to be above the state average at 96%, the 68 students that have 10 or more absences can be impacted negatively according to research that concludes that more absences are linked to lower academic achievement and that the "relationship between absences and achievement suggest negative effects on standardized test performance resulting from an increase in absences..." (Monk & Ibrahim 1984).

However, while only 4 of the 21 identified students with disabilities had 10 or more absences, less than 10% of the remaining 64 students identified with significant absences failed one or more sections of the state assessment. Continued monitoring of the attendance program as well as providing incentives will continue to support students with attendance challenges.

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

Students with Disabilities

1. Improving the subgroup of Students with Disabilities to increase student pass scores beyond the Federal Index indicator and supporting all students to a higher level of educational success.
2. Providing all teachers with professional learning opportunities through a more structured opportunity for collaboration to support Students with Disabilities and all students at DCS.
3. Employing 4 specific evidence-based strategies as outlined in the Planning for Improvement section of this document that will positively impact all content areas measured by the State of Florida and ESSA.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Students with Disabilities
Rationale	<p>The subgroup of students with disabilities is the only area below the Federal Index of 41% measuring currently at 35%, placing DCS as an identified TS&I school. Students in this subgroup have identified learning needs where strategic intervention is needed to assist them in attaining success. While students in this subgroup are making some measured progress as evidenced in individual progress monitoring, the ELA learning gains, ELA lowest 25%, and Math lowest 25% are all areas that decreased from 2018 to 2019 and include students with disabilities in each of these content areas. Increasing strategies for success with this subgroup will positively affect all content areas. There are no other subgroups for DCS that fall below the Federal Index nor do any of the content areas measured fall below the district or state averages.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>Currently the subgroup of students with disabilities has an achievement rate of 35%. DCS proposes that since there are 20 identified students within this subgroup for the 2019-2020 school year, it is attainable that 10 students in ELA (12 of which did not pass last year but 10 students attained a level 2) will reach a passing score on the state assessment and 10 students in Math (11 of which did not pass last year but 5 students attained a level 2). Therefore the goal is to reach a 41% - 50% pass rate for the subgroup of students with disabilities in 2020, taking DCS out of the TS&I category for monitoring. Additionally, DCS will commit to a measured increase each year thereafter in this subgroup and all measured areas.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	<p>Yesenia Marichal Santiago (944974@dadeschools.net)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>1. Vertical/Horizontal Collaboration: Research suggests that teaching experience and pedagogical preparation matter for student achievement when teachers have opportunities to learn from their peers in their school over time.</p> <p>2. Differentiation of Instruction: Dixon, Yssel, McConnell, & Hardin, (2014) note that even though teachers cognitively understand the strategies introduced during PD sessions on differentiation and can identify diverse students in their classrooms, they may subsequently not translate the material covered in the PD into practice in the classroom.</p> <p>3. "Just Read" Initiative Problems in reading can affect performance across several academic content areas (Joseph L., 2002). Likewise, improvement in reading positively affects student performance in all other subject areas.</p> <p>4. Technology Interventions Studies have shown that there is a positive correlation of computer intervention on reading (Foster, Erickson, Foster, Brinkman & Torgesen 1994) and that technology can be used as an assistive tool for acquiring better literacy/reading skills (Speaker, 2004).</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>In response to the needs analysis through observation and discussion with the administrative team, the department chairs and the EESAC committee, DCS identified 4 evidence-based teaching interventions to support increased learning gains for students with disabilities.</p>

The rationale that supports the selection of these interventions is that DCS has provided for vertical and horizontal collaboration within the current schedule that will support this intervention when monitored with fidelity. Creating a structure that works for staff will increase collaboration within departments and across grade levels. Including DI development among all staff is critical to reaching all students.

In addition, in 2019-20 DCS has one-to-one opportunities with technology in the classroom that will support technology interventions at a higher level.

Furthermore, more support is needed through a structured school-wide reading initiative to provide success opportunities and support for students with disabilities in reading/math as well as all students at DCS.

Action Step

1. Vertical/Horizontal Teacher Collaboration

Teachers will conference on a routine basis to plan lessons, review curriculum, and analyze data for the purpose of guiding instruction. This can be done via the designated common planning time set aside every Monday for all teachers. Common planning days must be monitored and reported by the administrative team led by the principals, Director of Student Services and guidance counselors. A plan is being developed to offer departmental collaboration in addition to departmental business meetings for teaching and learning topics as well as across grade level collaboration to discuss specific student needs with all teachers of rostered students. A specific emphasis will be made to regularly discuss the needs of the 20 students identified as students with disabilities.

The evidence of practice will be obtained through reflection notes, agendas and sign in sheets.

2. Differentiation of Instruction (DI):

Utilizing monthly staff meetings and professional development days, a team will construct professional development activities to promote strategies and opportunities for learning to build teacher efficacy in DI. Additionally, the principals will work with teachers through their support model for evaluation (SFS) to encourage strategies in the classroom through observational data and discussion. Observing, collaborating and providing reinforcement for practicing DI strategies will support teachers in translating DI material covered in staff meetings and PD sessions to the classroom setting. According Dixon, Yssel, McConnell, & Hardin (2014) it was noted in their study that "although differentiation is a complex process in that students are doing different tasks based on a central concept, it relies on strong and skillful teachers to plan and implement different levels of the same concept at the same time."

3. "Just Read" Initiative

a. Offering 20 minutes of silent, sustained reading at the beginning or the end of each class. This implementation can focus on three strands: vocabulary, reading or writing within the class.

b. Every teacher should include a reading activity relevant to their subject and the related topic/unit focus throughout the school year.

Evidence of fidelity will include documentation in lesson plans and cited on principal walk-throughs.

4. Technology Intervention

Utilizing i-Ready for intensive reading students, NWEA for all students in grades 6-8 and Unify for 9-10 for ELA and Math, Vocabulary.com for ELA interventions, and Imagine Math,

Description

Prepworks for math interventions with greater fidelity will assist all students in gaining success. DCS has the tools and just completed professional development on MAP Skills within NWEA that includes learning how to utilize Mastery Checks within the program. In the past year, NWEA was used mostly as a diagnostic tool and now should be utilized full for instruction, resources and mastery checks that tracks student progress and informs instruction. Student goal setting should also be included. All technology tools for intervention will be tracked with greater fidelity to ensure student progress in ELA and Math.

Evidence to be collected will be formative assessment data and progress monitoring data with all the available tools to measure student progress in reading/ELA and Math.

Person Responsible Edward Jackson (955595@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).

School-Wide Initiative: The focus of school-wide professional development for all teachers at DCS will be on:

1. Differentiated Instruction and
2. Direct/Explicit instruction techniques that teaches meta-cognitive reading strategies across the curriculum.

Professional development for teachers is said to be a key factor for improving classroom instruction and student achievement (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Corcoran, Shields, & Zucker, 1998.) Direct/explicit and DI strategies are important tools for the success of struggling students, but also important to engage and enrich over-achieving students. (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Dignath & Buttner, 2008; Kamil et al, 2008; Pressley, 2003).

The content of the PDs will be planned by the Administrative Team and a select team of teachers consisting of the Intensive Reading Teacher, Department Chairs from each of the core content areas and a select number of highly effective teachers who have a track record of success and a wealth of best practices to share. The team will determine the precise areas of information to deliver during the professional development sessions which may consist of portions of each monthly staff meeting in addition to the scheduled professional development days throughout the school year. The administrative Team will go through the PDCA cycle of plan, do, check, and act to ensure that teachers become equipped, monitored and that their progress is being documented.

Evidence collected will include a PD agenda and sign in sheet. Additionally, the use of student data will be a primary focus. The efficacy of the professional development sessions and the impact on instruction will reflect in student performance through:

1. Implementing topic/standards assessments or mastery checks every 3 weeks to track student mastery throughout the school year.
2. The administrators will schedule data chats with teachers on student progress and intervention strategies across the topics and standards.
3. Scheduled topic assessments as well as formative assessments will be in place and data discussions will drive instructional opportunities for every teacher.