

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# North Park High School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>20</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>20</b> |

# North Park High School

3400 NW 135TH ST, Opa Locka, FL 33054

<http://yourdiplomayourway.com/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Stacey Ann Frater**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/24/2020

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Alternative Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 30%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: No Grade<br>2017-18: No Grade<br>2016-17: No Grade<br>2015-16: No Grade  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | CS&I  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>20</b> |

## North Park High School

3400 NW 135TH ST, Opa Locka, FL 33054

<http://yourdiplomayourway.com/>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School<br>9-12                              | No                     | %  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| Alternative Education                            | Yes                    | %  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2012-13 | 2011-12 |
|-------|---------|---------|
| Grade |         |         |

### 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.**

The mission of North Park High School is to help at risk students earn a standard high school diploma and prepare for post secondary success.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

The vision of North Park High School is to provide quality education to all students regardless of their life circumstances, recognizing that at risk students have different needs, learn at different rates, and have diverse learning styles which cause many of these at risk students to drop out of school.

### 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   |
|----------------------|------------------------|---|
| Frater,<br>Stacey    | Principal              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collect and analyze school data as the basis for monitoring and improving the school's measurable outcomes and contractual obligations with a focus on a cycle of continuous improvement.</li> <li>• Recruit, hire, and retain highly qualified school staff.</li> <li>• Lead all initiatives to ensure school meets defined FTE enrollment and attendance goals.</li> <li>• Set clear and rigorous expectations for staff performance, accountability, and adherence to company policies and procedures.</li> <li>• Monitor and evaluate staff performance systematically and regularly. Provide staff feedback and develop professional growth plans when necessary. Follow through with progressive discipline when expectations are not met.</li> <li>• Foster effective communication and relationships with all internal and external stakeholders which would include the company's mission and vision, performance results, school activities, and other information pertinent to the individual stakeholder groups.</li> </ul>  |
| stephens,<br>michael | Assistant<br>Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Encourage an environment of student success, including a focus on success after graduation</li> <li>o Maintain direct and indirect student contact to monitor progress and academic success</li> <li>o Monitor graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment, post-graduation employment, and additional training or military enlistments</li> <li>o On-going individual student academic advising</li> <li>o Student preparation and staff administration of all standardized assessments</li> <li>o Compliance with Exceptional Student Education (ESE) and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) requirements</li> <li>• Assist the Principal in recruiting and hiring highly-qualified instructional staff.</li> </ul>   |
| Antuche,<br>Romelia  | Teacher,<br>K-12       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a learning environment of high student accountability that is student-centered and aligned with the school's academic goals and specified objectives.</li> <li>• Provide direction and leadership within the classroom by displaying an effective working knowledge of the subject matter and by demonstrating best practices relating to teaching/instructional techniques.</li> <li>• Assist in all initiatives to ensure school meets defined FTE enrollment and attendance goals.</li> <li>• Maintain progress monitoring reports, attendance and behavioral records, academic grades, and other student records as required by state regulatory guidelines and company policy and procedures.</li> <li>• Collaborate effectively and professionally with peers to develop, plan, and implement best educational practices based upon the individual academic needs of the students that are aligned with company goals.</li> <li>• Participate in professional development courses or activities to maintain appropriate certification or credentials based on position.</li> </ul> |



| Name             | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Matherne, Amanda | Teacher, ESE        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Observation of ability to effectively assist students in using strategies in their assigned subject area(s)</li> <li>o Observation of the use of a variety of instructional techniques and interventions to effectively support the special education students in the advisory classroom at all levels</li> <li>o Documentation indicating the ability to evaluate and assess academic needs of ESE students – IEP Notes and Progress Monitoring Logs</li> <li>o Observation of ability to intervene and conduct data-driven small group intensive interventions for reading, math and/or subject area(s)</li> <li>o Observation and documentation of the ability to provide differentiated instruction and strategies based on student data – IEP Notes and Progress Monitoring Logs</li> <li>o Progress Monitoring Logs and academic planning meeting notes indicate consultation and collaboration with advisory teachers and other staff members on strategies, modifications, and activities that can assist student to increase achievement in assigned subject area(s)</li> <li>o Students can relate ESE Teacher's high expectations for student improvement and success</li> <li>o Progress Monitoring Log indicates timely reporting of students in need of academic support or intervention in accordance with the RtI model</li> </ul> |
| Santana, Monica  | Teacher, K-12       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a learning environment of high student accountability that is student-centered and aligned with the school's academic goals and specified objectives.</li> <li>• Provide direction and leadership within the classroom by displaying an effective working knowledge of the subject matter and by demonstrating best practices relating to teaching/instructional techniques.</li> <li>• Assist in all initiatives to ensure school meets defined FTE enrollment and attendance goals.</li> <li>• Maintain progress monitoring reports, attendance and behavioral records, academic grades, and other student records as required by state regulatory guidelines and company policy and procedures.</li> <li>• Collaborate effectively and professionally with peers to develop, plan, and implement best educational practices based upon the individual academic needs of the students that are aligned with company goals.</li> <li>• Participate in professional development courses or activities to maintain appropriate certification or credentials based on position.</li> </ul>   |
| greene, vanazza  | Instructional Coach | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a learning environment of high student accountability that is student-centered and aligned with the school's academic goals and specified objectives.</li> <li>• Provide direction and leadership within the classroom by displaying an effective working knowledge of the subject matter and by demonstrating best practices relating to teaching/instructional techniques.</li> <li>• Assist in all initiatives to ensure school meets defined FTE enrollment and attendance goals.</li> <li>• Maintain progress monitoring reports, attendance and behavioral records, academic grades, and other student records as required by state regulatory guidelines and company policy and procedures.</li> </ul>  |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|------|-------|---|
|      |       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaborate effectively and professionally with peers to develop, plan, and implement best educational practices based upon the individual academic needs of the students that are aligned with company goals.</li> <li>• Participate in professional development courses or activities to maintain appropriate certification or credentials based on position.</li> </ul> |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 8/24/2020, Stacey Ann Frater

**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.*

0

**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.*

3

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

10

#### Demographic Data

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Alternative Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 30%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: No Grade<br>2017-18: No Grade  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | 2016-17: No Grade<br>2015-16: No Grade   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast                                |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a> |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A                                      |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | CS&I                                     |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> . |  |

## 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 | 33 | 69 | 281 | 383   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5  | 49 | 233 | 287   |
| 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  | 2   | 2     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 4  | 1   | 6     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 15 | 234 | 249   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8  | 53 | 231 | 292   |

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 | 1  | 15 | 166 | 182   |

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**

Sunday 8/30/2020

**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 | 4 | 21 | 109 | 293 | 427   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 89  | 226 | 331   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1   | 0   | 1     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4  | 14  | 8   | 26    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 77  | 207 | 308   |

**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 | 4 | 4  | 76 | 220 | 304   |

**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 | 4 | 21 | 109 | 293 | 427   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 89  | 226 | 331   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1   | 0   | 1     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4  | 14  | 8   | 26    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 77  | 207 | 308   |

**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 | 4 | 4  | 76 | 220 | 304   |

**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             | 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 |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|           | 9                                 | 10  | 11  | 12  |       |
|           | (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 |
| 09                    | 2019 | 0%     | 55%      | -55%                       | 55%   | -55%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 0%     | 54%      | -54%                       | 53%   | -53%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 10                    | 2019 | 6%     | 53%      | -47%                       | 53%   | -47%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 5%     | 54%      | -49%                       | 53%   | -48%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| SCIENCE |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| BIOLOGY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019        | 3%     | 68%      | -65%                  | 67%   | -64%               |
| 2018        | 3%     | 65%      | -62%                  | 65%   | -62%               |
| Compare     |        | 0%       |                       |       |                    |

| 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        | 5%     | 71%      | -66%                  | 70%   | -65%               |
| 2018        | 2%     | 67%      | -65%                  | 68%   | -66%               |
| Compare     |        | 3%       |                       |       |                    |

| ALGEBRA EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019        | 5%     | 63%      | -58%                  | 61%   | -56%               |
| 2018        | 0%     | 59%      | -59%                  | 62%   | -62%               |
| Compare     |        | 5%       |                       |       |                    |

| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 2%     | 54%      | -52%                  | 57%   | -55%               |
| 2018         | 0%     | 54%      | -54%                  | 56%   | -56%               |
| Compare      |        | 2%       |                       |       |                    |

### 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                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 18                |                     |
| ELL                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 14                |                     |
| BLK                                       |          | 23     |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 30                | 14                  |
| HSP                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 23                | 10                  |
| FRL                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 24                | 10                  |
| 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  | 12   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | YES  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 5    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 28   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 94   |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 77%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 18   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 2    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 11   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 2    |

| 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                                    | 17  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     | 2   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 17  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 2   |
| 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                                | 11  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 2   |



## 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.**

Student assessment data for the 2019-2020 school year is currently unavailable; however, data from the most recent reported school year indicates that Algebra I and Geometry has lowest percentage of students earning mastery.

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

Student assessment data for the 2019-2020 school year is currently unavailable; however, data from the most recently reported school year indicates that percentage mastery in Biology had the greatest decline.

**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.**

Student assessment data for the 2019-2020 school year is currently unavailable; however, Social Studies and Science data results has shown the greatest gap when compared to the state.

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

Student assessment data for the 2019-2020 school year is currently unavailable; however, mastery on ELA from the previous year had the highest percentage of students passing. This is due large in part to the small group tutoring and progress monitoring of interventionists and teachers.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

Based on the EWS data reported in Part 1 (D), the school has identified high student absenteeism and low performance on FSA ELA as two potential areas of concern.

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

1. Learning Gains increase in ELA
2. Learning Gains increase in Algebra I
3. Attendance percentage increase of 3 percent

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** North Park is awarded a school improvement rating yearly from the state. This rating comprises of an average of learning gains earned in Math and ELA . For the 2018-2019 school year, 28 percent of eligible students earned a learning gain in ELA. This year, there needs to be a focus on increasing the learning gains in this area through a focus on teacher development, implementation of research based best practices and the use of targeted student intervention.

**Measurable Outcome:** The school plans to increase learning gains in ELA by 10 percentage points.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Stacey Frater (953237@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The strategies that will be used involved:  
 1. The disaggregating of previous year data in order to place students in focus groups  
 2. Reading Interventionist using direct/explicit instruction to re-teach concepts identified in data disaggregating process  
 3. Reading Interventionist and students use of grade level appropriate text to simulate FSA type questions  
 4. Students engaging in bi-weekly mini assessments to assess mastery

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explicit Instruction and Differentiated instruction techniques will allow teachers to use data to determine strategic focus areas that students need remediation. In addition, when teachers use explicit instructional techniques, students are able to fill instructional gaps by following a model (the teacher).

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Professional Development provided to all teachers in explicit instruction and differentiated instruction
2. Lesson studies conducted to plan and execute effective lessons
3. Teacher-peer observations and debrief sessions
4. Review of student work sample
5. Administrative walkthroughs and debrief sessions with teachers

**Person Responsible** Stacey Frater (953237@dadeschools.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** North Park is awarded a school improvement rating yearly from the state. This rating comprises of an average of learning gains earned in Math and ELA . For the 2018-2019 school year, 85 percent of eligible students earned a learning gain in Math. This year, there needs to be a focus on increasing the learning gains in this area through a focus on teacher development, implementation of research based best practices and the use of targeted student intervention.

**Measurable Outcome:** The school plans to increase learning gains in Math by 5 percentage points.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** michael stephens (michael.stephen@als-education.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The strategies that will be used involved:  
 1. The disaggregating of previous year data in order to target deficient areas in Math  
 2. Math Interventionist using direct/explicit instruction to re-teach concepts identified in data disaggregating process  
 3. Math Interventionist and students use of grade level appropriate text to simulate EOC type questions  
 4. Math Interventionist also prepares students for PERT assessment which can be used as a concordant replacement for students in the 17-18 cohort.  
 4. Students engaging in bi-weekly mini assessments to assess mastery

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explicit Instruction and Differentiated instruction techniques will allow teachers to use data to determine strategic focus areas that students need remediation. In addition, when teachers use explicit instructional techniques, students are able to fill instructional gaps by following a model (the teacher).

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Professional Development provided to all teachers in explicit instruction and differentiated instruction
2. Lesson studies conducted to plan and execute effective lessons
3. Teacher-peer observations and debrief sessions
4. Review of student work sample
5. Administrative walkthroughs and debrief sessions with teachers

**Person Responsible** michael stephens (michael.stephen@als-education.com)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**School leadership will also work to address student absenteeism. Average daily student attendance percentage is 65 percent. School leadership will work with teachers and school based Family Support Specialists to identify students with a history of high absenteeism. These students will receive additional support via home visits, one on one meetings with staff members as well as an execution of a weekly student attendance contract.**

## 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.

Parents are invited to attend orientation meetings twice per year. This school year, there was a series of parent zoom meeting held so that parents and students could connect virtually with school leaders and teachers. In addition, parents still receive weekly Progress Reports via email regarding their students' work and attendance during the week. Every parent is contacted by phone at least once per month with a positive comment about their child. Our administration and teachers are available by phone and in person during school hours. We encourage all contact with parents.

### 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: Instructional Practice: ELA  | \$0.00 |
| 2      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| Total: |        |  | \$0.00 |