Downtown Doral Charter Upper School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Downtown Doral Charter Upper School

7905 NW 53RD ST, Doral, FL 33166

www.ddcus.org

Demographics

Principal: Kim Ortiz

Start Date for this Principal: 9/3/2018

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2019-20 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
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.](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

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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	No	40%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	96%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	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.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lapica, Wilhelm	Principal	
Orta, Lourdes	Administrative Support	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 9/3/2018, Kim Ortiz

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
51

Demographic Data

2020-21 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

2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2019-20 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
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.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/12/2020

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	
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	

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	
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	

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**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

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					
	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
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)	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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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 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 the 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?

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. An increase in the effectiveness of our counseling department for academic and emotional needs of our students.
2. Bridging learning gaps between grade levels to decrease lack in basic academic skills.
3. Increase staff connections and morale.
4. Overall health for our staff and students during this difficult time.
5. Reduce distance learning impact.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Climate Survey showed that 47% of our students were unsure if the counseling department properly addressed their needs while 15% agreed that they felt under-served by the counseling department. Lack of support from the counseling department can result in academic failure and emotional distress.
Measurable Outcome:	The schools plans to achieve a 15% increase in positive sentiment towards the counseling department.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lourdes Orta (lourdesmorta@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increasing the counseling department and assigning specific roles to each counselor, as well as assigning an individual counselor per student are the evidence-based strategies we will implement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the Professional Journal for Educators "a study of counseling practices in six states shows that effective counseling strategies tend to have positive effects on classroom attendance, discipline, and overall achievement (Carey & Dimmitt, 2012). These studies suggest that school counseling programs are most successful when counseling services include more than a response to a situation that already exists." This research emphasizes that when counseling encompasses academics and emotional health, students are able to reach their full academic, career and emotional potential. https://kappanonline.org/oconnor-school-counselors-make-world-difference/

Action Steps to Implement

1. Increased counseling department (by 3)
2. Assigned roles to each counselor (Academics counselor, college counselor, trust counselor).
3. Assign students personal counselor (By last name).
4. Small-group counseling activities (Quarterly).
5. Classroom presentations on topics that promote academic and social-emotional growth for parents and students.
6. Counseling intervention program.

Person Responsible	Wilhelm Lapica (wlapica@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Climate Survey showed that 67% of teachers feel their students are deficient in basic academic skills. Additionally, 42 % of teachers feel that their students are not academically prepared for class. The learning gap grows exponentially between each year and becomes more difficult to close as the courses increase in rigor.
Measurable Outcome:	In the next climate survey for the 2020-2021 school year, the school plans to achieve a 50% or higher in rate of satisfaction in basic academic skills and academic preparation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Wilhelm Lapica (wlapica@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will continue our cooperative planning within departments with more defined guidelines and we will begin implementing interdisciplinary planning to bridge learning gaps between grade levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The peer review article, "The State of Cooperative Learning in Postsecondary and Professional Settings" found in Educational Psychology Review, highlights the outcomes of interdependence. Among these outcomes are, higher achievements, positive social relationships, psychological health, prominent civic values, and a positive outlook towards college. https://soe.rutgers.edu/sites/default/files/imce/pdfs/Johnson_StateCoperativeLearning.pdf

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create more intervention groups starting early in the year (Math, English, Spanish, Portuguese).
2. Interdisciplinary unit planning.
3. Vertical and horizontal planning.

Person Responsible	Lourdes Orta (lourdesmorta@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**For priorities 1 and 2 listed on 2.E, our plan of action is detailed in the area of focus.
To increase staff connections and morale, priority 3, we created a more diverse "Social Committee" including one member of each department. The Social committee will make a presence monthly with games, give-away, and social "virtual" gatherings for the staff. Furthermore, to target priority 4, the health of our student and staff, we have an abundance of new policies detailing norms for moving through the building, disinfecting, safety attire, visitors in the building, reporting of illness, and more. Finally, to target distance learning impact; priority 5, interventions have increased and counselors created an intervention tier procedure to target absences, behavior, and course failures.**

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

At Downtown Doral Charter Upper School, we believe that proper educational formation requires multiple entities to come together. A child needs a working partnership between the home, school, and community. For this reason, we have opened our doors to all families and encouraged active involvement. Our families complete a total of 20 volunteer hours per year. Meaning, that parental participation in school events is always high. We ensure we serve our students well by allowing them to voice their interest and using them to guide our offerings. Many of the clubs, such as photography, chess, spirit squad, mental health and awareness, and more, were all proposed by our own student body. With our Administration's open door policy, our teachers have endless opportunities to take initiatives and provide feedback when needed. Our counselors and activities director focus on bringing in outside sources such as prominent business leaders and community members. We are located in an ideal community and have formed bonds with the near by businesses who attend our events such as, career day, Hispanic heritage, Brazilian independence, and more. Overall, here at Downtown Doral Charter Upper School we have prioritized a family environment to ensure involvement from all stakeholders which has granted the school the Five Star School Award. We acknowledge that these partnerships permits a successful education journey for our students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00