

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Downtown Doral Charter Upper School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Downtown Doral Charter Upper School

7905 NW 53RD ST, Doral, FL 33166

www.ddcus.org

Demographics

Principal: Kim Ortiz

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
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 Asian Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (90%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
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	N/A

* 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	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Downtown Doral Charter Upper School

7905 NW 53RD ST, Doral, FL 33166

www.ddcus.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	25%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	95%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19
Grade	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.

Downtown Doral Charter Upper School's mission is to provide our students with a comprehensive dual curriculum and bicultural/bilingual education through language acquisition and innovative programs, facilitated by a highly-qualified staff promoting students' academic excellence creating future world leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Downtown Doral Charter Upper School is Innovative Leaders Nurturing Passionate Global Leaders.

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
Lapica, Wilhelm	Principal	
Orta, Lourdes	Administrative Support	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/29/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	94%	59%	56%	0%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	83%	54%	51%	0%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	84%	48%	42%	0%	45%	41%
Math Achievement	94%	54%	51%	0%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	93%	52%	48%	0%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	92%	51%	45%	0%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	68%	68%	0%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	76%	73%	0%	71%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (6)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (6)

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	93%	58%	35%	54%	39%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	93%	58%	35%	55%	38%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ELL	92	82	88	86	95	92					
HSP	93	82	83	93	92	91					
FRL	91	87		91	96						
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
ELL	92	82	88	86	95	92					
HSP	93	82	83	93	92	91					
FRL	91	87		91	96						
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
ELL	92	82	88	86	95	92					
HSP	93	82	83	93	92	91					
FRL	91	87		91	96						

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	90
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	540
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100%

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	89
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	89
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	
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	91
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.

The lowest components is ELA Gains. Unable to define trends for the school due to insufficient data collection.

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

Decline is not observable as we only have data from our first year of operation (2018-2019).

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.

All of our data components are above the state average. The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Math Lowest 25% Percentile, scoring at 92% with state at 45%. Trends are not measurable at this moment due to insufficient data collection.

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

Data is only available for one academic year. Improvement is not observable due to insufficient data collection.

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

Although our percentages far exceed the district and state average, we expect to see continued growth in the area of ELA, being our lowest percentages of 83% (ELA Gains) and 84% (ELA Gains Lowest 25%).

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

1. One priority for this school year is to increase our resources for students and staff, increasing our support staff and technological resources.
2. Another priority for this school year is to improve work management by establishing departments, introducing zone period, after school programs, and online resources.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Resource
Rationale	The Climate Survey showed that 19% of our students were uncertain if they were given proper staff support, while 33% of our teachers felt they were lacking in resources. This school year we have increased our staff by 800% creating more support for our students and faculty. Additionally, we have introduced a variety of new technological resources.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The school plans to achieve a 31% increase in student sentiment about staff support, as well as a 42% increase in teacher response to resources.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lourdes Orta (lourdesmorta@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>The evidence-based strategy used is enhancing collaborative opportunities and communication among students and staff.</p> <p>When students are given proper support, their learning environment is enriched and they are better able to build trusting relationships and further encouraged to confidently seek assistance and guidance from school personnel. A school replete with a wealth of resources is conducive to learning and positively impacts the school climate. Furthermore, teachers with the proper support and guidance can impact students positively and improve the efficiency and effectiveness of their instruction. Principles outlining increased teacher effectiveness are addressed in Leverage Leadership 2.0, a resource book by Paul Bambrick-Santoyo addressing student and staff culture, observation and feedback, among other topics. The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership by Stephen Covey, is a second resource book intended to guide and inspire educational leaders. Both books are resources provided to members of the administrative team and are implemented to guide them in their leadership.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Technological Resources (iPads and Cleartouch boards) b. Classroom Management and Parental Involvement c. Ethics Matters d. ESOL and ESE 2. Support Staff <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ms. Medina (CAP Advisor/Zone Period Coordinator) b. Ms. Padilla (ESE Specialist) c. Ms. Katengell (ESE Specialist) d. Dr. Ortega (Guidance Counselor) e. Ms. Martinez (ESOL Specialist) f. Ms. Brand (Speech Therapist) g. Mr. Martinez (Athletics Director) h. Ms. Orta (Lead Teacher) i. Ms. Ortiz (Lead Teacher) j. Officer Barret (SRO) 3. Available Resources for Growth

- a. Extended Hours Program (onsite tutoring service)
- b. Enrichment Offerings (Unyted: Social emotional education through science-targeting self-awareness, self-management, social-awareness, interpersonal relationships, and responsible decision making)
- c. Mentor/Mentee Program (veteran teachers paired with new teachers for training and guidance)

Person Responsible	Wilhelm Lapica (wlapica@dadeschools.net)
---------------------------	--

#2	
Title	Work Management
Rationale	The Climate Survey showed that 1 out of the 3 teachers who participated in the survey agreed with the statement that they frequently felt overloaded and overwhelmed while working at the school. Meanwhile, 13% of our students are uncertain if they are receiving meaningful homework assignments. Implementing technological resources like Showbie, including innovative programs like Zone Period, and increasing faculty and staff size will result in a balanced workload and will assist in decreasing the feeling of being overwhelmed.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Downtown Doral Charter Upper School intends to have less than 25% of teachers respond with negative sentiment about work/life balance, while also decreasing the percentage of students who feel the assigned homework is not meaningful to 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Wilhelm Lapica (wlapica@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>The evidence-based strategy used is effectively using online tools such as, Showbie, Apple Classroom, Remind101, Padlet, and Zone Period App among others.</p> <p>Teachers shape the culture of learning more effectively when using technology in the classroom. This enhanced learning culture targets the individual needs of students and contributes to increased student engagement and personal growth. The use of interactive technology also prepares students for college and career readiness. Time management is another key skill necessary in our students' social and academic life. With proper training, students can learn how to self-regulate and organize themselves to become more productive. Lastly, emphasizing the importance of collaboration allows the school to run like a team, every member forming an integral part. These statements are supported in the following articles and book:</p> <p>https://learningworksforkids.com/skills/time-management/ https://www.capella.edu/blogs/cublog/benefits-of-technology-in-the-classroom/ Beyond the Education Wars: Evidence That Collaboration Builds Effective Schools.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaboration <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Formation of Departments (Increasing each department from 1 teacher to a team) b. Mentor/Mentee program (support to our new teachers from our veteran teachers) 2. Workload <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Showbie, Apple Classroom, and other apps (designed to upload and store student work. Students may also work on these apps and turn in assignments with the click of a button, reducing physical workbook load. Teachers can grade through these apps and file student works automatically.) b. Zone Period (a daily 50-minute teacher supervised, self-guided time for students intended to enrich and enhance student performance and participation: school work; work on groups projects; participation in physical activities; wellness and mindfulness training.)
Person Responsible	Wilhelm Lapica (wlapica@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 V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Resource	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Work Management	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00