City Of Hialeah Educational Academy

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

City Of Hialeah Educational Academy

2590 W 76TH ST, Hialeah, FL 33016

www.hialeaheduacademy

Demographics

Principal: Carlos Alvarez

Start Date for this Principal: 8/31/2020

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
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 Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

City Of Hialeah Educational Academy

2590 W 76TH ST, Hialeah, FL 33016

www.hialeaheduacademy

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	Yes	92%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	99%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	B

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.

The City of Hialeah Educational Academy is committed to setting an environment that strives for academic achievement, develops character and maintains the goal of preparing students to serve and give back to their community in the field of public service.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of the City of Hialeah Educational Academy is to provide a high quality, rigorous career oriented curriculum that will prepare students for successful progression into post-secondary education and productive employment within a multilingual work environment.

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
Alvarez, Carlos	Principal	-Day-to-day school operations -Curriculum Decisions -Purchasing Decisions -Facilities Enhancements -School Budget/approves all purchases -SACS/AdvancED -School Wellness Plans -School Improvement Plan (SIP) -Parent concerns -Building maintenance -Faculty meetings -Leadership Meeting -Crisis management -Fire Alarm Contact -Annual School Accountability Report -Personnel Issues Evaluations/Supervision -Maintenance Approvals -Technology purchases and approvals -Conflict Resolution -Discipline -EESAC -Threat Assessment Team -FSSA Safety and Security -SESIR -Athletics -Mental Health
Puente, Ivelisse	Assistant Principal	Principal's designee when the Principal is not present - School Improvement Plan (SIP) -Test Chair for K-9 -Accreditations/SACS -ESOL Compliance -Parent Concerns -Discipline -Certification/Waivers -STEM Liaison -Reports Final Decisions and Approvals to Principal -FCPCS Evaluations/Supervision -PD Supervisor -IPGP -Gradebook Supervisor -Conflict Resolution -Title I and Title III -Master Schedules -Member of Threat Assessment Team
Montelongo, Daniel	Assistant Principal	-Principal's designee when the Principal is not present -Parent Concerns -Discipline

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		-Crisis Management -Reports Final Decisions and Approvals to Principal -Daily Evaluations/Supervision -Conflict Resolution -Assisting with Charter Tools -Master Schedules -Member of Threat Assessment Team -EESAC -Industry Certification -Title I Community Involvement
Carbajosa, Graciela	Administrative Support	-Curriculum Planning/Data Driven/Evidence Based -Analyze data and diagnose student needs per subjects -Conduct classroom walkthroughs of all teachers and offer support where needed -Collaborate with all content areas to address needs -Guidance with instructional resources -Assist administration with any request as needed -Computer Software Purchasing - Reading & Math -Website Administrator -AP Coordinator
Gonzalez, Kristine	School Counselor	-School Counseling -Group counseling -CAP Advisor -Liaison for all wellness programs -Middle and High School Course Requirements -College Readiness Advocate -Virtual School Contact and Facilitator -Parental support -Mental Health -CRISIS and DCF Guidance -Character Education Program Liaison -Member of Threat Assessment Team
Simpson, Amy	Instructional Coach	-Guide ELA/Reading Dept.planning and meetings -Conduct classroom walkthroughs of all teachers and offer support where needed and students, coaching -Model engaging, standard-based lessons as needed -Collaborate with the ELA/Reading Dept. and address needs -Guidance with instructional resources -Attend district and Mater, Inc reading coaches meetings -Debrief and model new strategies -Assist administration with any request as needed -Mater Spelling Bee - i-Ready Program

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ramos, Monica	Instructional Coach	-Guide ELA/Reading Dept. planning and meetings -Conduct classroom walkthroughs of all teachers and offer support where needed and students, coaching -Model engaging, standard-based lessons as needed -Collaborate with the ELA/Reading Dept. and address needs -Guidance with instructional resources -Attend district and Mater, Inc reading coaches meetings -Debrief and model new strategies -Assist administration with any request as needed
Sanchez, Monica	Instructional Coach	-Guide Math Dept.planning and meetings -STEM planning and meetings -Conduct classroom walkthroughs of all teachers and offer support where needed and students, coaching -Model engaging, standard-based lessons as needed -Collaborate with the Math Dept. and address needs -Guidance with instructional resources -Attend district Math coaches meetings -Debrief and model new strategies -Assist administration with any request as needed - i-Ready Program Math
Hernandez, Madelyn	Instructional Coach	-Guide Science Dept.planning and meetings -Conduct classroom walkthroughs of all teachers and offer support where needed and students, coaching -Model engaging, standard-based lessons as needed -Collaborate with the Science Dept. and address needs -Guidance with instructional resources -Attend district meetings -Debrief and model new strategies -Assist administration with any request as needed

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/31/2020, Carlos Alvarez

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.*
35

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.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
44

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
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 Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	130	132	145	139	125	153	119	943
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	7	0	4	4	28
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	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	12	20	51	32	0	1	14	130

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

Monday 8/31/2020

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	117	142	135	124	153	120	124	915
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		
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	28	62	59	52	0	51	41	293

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	18	49	32	17	8	21	27	172

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	117	142	135	124	153	120	124	915
Attendance below 90 percent	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		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	62	59	52	0	51	41	293

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	18	49	32	17	8	21	27	172

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	58%	59%	56%	56%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	54%	51%	59%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	48%	42%	51%	45%	41%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	64%	54%	51%	46%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	58%	52%	48%	47%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	51%	45%	47%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	49%	68%	68%	43%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	75%	76%	73%	66%	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	56%	58%	-2%	54%	2%
	2018	52%	53%	-1%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	57%	56%	1%	52%	5%
	2018	62%	54%	8%	51%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	62%	60%	2%	56%	6%
	2018	61%	59%	2%	58%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	56%	55%	1%	55%	1%
	2018	60%	54%	6%	53%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
10	2019	57%	53%	4%	53%	4%
	2018	54%	54%	0%	53%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	51%	58%	-7%	55%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	75%	56%	19%	52%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	66%	53%	13%	54%	12%
	2018	73%	52%	21%	54%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
08	2019	85%	40%	45%	46%	39%
	2018	56%	38%	18%	45%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		29%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	33%	43%	-10%	48%	-15%
	2018	25%	44%	-19%	50%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	68%	-9%	67%	-8%
2018	58%	65%	-7%	65%	-7%
Compare		1%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	76%	73%	3%	71%	5%
2018	76%	72%	4%	71%	5%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	71%	1%	70%	2%
2018	58%	67%	-9%	68%	-10%
Compare		14%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	69%	63%	6%	61%	8%
2018	70%	59%	11%	62%	8%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	54%	5%	57%	2%
2018	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Compare		10%			

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	15	44	41	28	42	29		64			
ELL	39	48	47	53	48	41	35	66	42	97	97
HSP	58	55	50	64	58	47	49	75	50	99	98
WHT	50			50							
FRL	57	55	51	63	58	47	49	75	49	99	98
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	29	48		44	50						
ELL	34	59	60	54	57	55	26	50		96	96
HSP	59	63	57	64	60	53	43	65	53	97	71
FRL	59	63	58	63	59	52	43	64	55	96	69
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	21	16		19	38	50	27			100	40
ELL	32	54	57	38	49	57	28	40	18	87	45
HSP	55	59	52	46	47	46	43	66	54	96	54
FRL	54	58	52	45	46	46	42	65	51	95	51

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	773
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	64
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	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	64
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 data component was in Math Lowest 25%, scoring at 47%. One contributing factor is the language barrier among the testing population.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year was ELA Learning Gains, scoring at 55% from 63%. One contributing factor is the language barrier among the testing population.

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.

The greatest gap in comparison to the state average was in Science achievement with the state scoring at 68%, and City of Hialeah Educational Academy scoring 49%. There is an increase from 43% to 49% in Science achievement from the prior year within our average.

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

The most improvement in data was in the Math Achievement group. The average increased from 51% in 2018 to 64% in 2019. City of Hialeah Educational Academy took many actions in this area. One action was to focus on intervention. Additionally, the school incorporated a pull-out system and Saturday tutoring focusing on student data and individual needs.

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

With most of our students being ELL, we are continuing to work on closing the learning gaps with adequate instructional strategies. We will also be focusing on our students with disabilities in ELA.

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

1. Increasing proficiency SWD population.
2. Increasing Math lowest 25th percentile.
3. Maintaining Social Studies achievement at least 75% proficiency.
4. Increasing ELA learning gains
5. Maintaining Math achievement at least 64% proficiency.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus that was identified as the critical need was SWD in Math. 32% of this subgroup scored level 1 in Math.
Measurable Outcome:	The SWD group will increase from 32% to 40%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ivelisse Puente (ipuente7@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students that scored a Level 1 score on the statewide, standardized assessment in mathematics will be placed in an intensive mathematics course for remediation. In addition, the students will receive push-in/pull-out as needed. The pull outs classes will be done in small groups, providing extra support in order to master the skills that have not yet been mastered.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	It has been proven here at COHEA that when we conduct push-ins and pull-outs our students increase academically. We collect data from iReady, Math XL, Edgenuity, statewide and district wide assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Meet with the Department Chair
2. Collect data within the school for the subgroup
3. Then the data analyze and collaborative discussions take place. Once the data is analyzed we work on the weakness of the students.
4. Create the groups based on the needs
5. Start the push-ins and pull-outs.
6. Pre-test and post- test

Person Responsible Ivelisse Puente (ipuente7@dadeschools.net)

#2. Other specifically relating to ELA Learning Gains	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus that we identified as a need from the data that was reviewed from the state is ELA Learning Gains. The ELA Learning Gains had a decrease from 63% to 55%.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA Learning Gains will increase by 5%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Graciela Carbajosa (carbajosag@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The intervention strategies employed by the school are dependent on the students area of weakness. If students received a level 1 or level 2 on the statewide assessment students are registered in an intensive reading course for remediation. In addition, our lowest 25th percentile receives weekly push-in services in their intensive reading course and/or pull out from an elective course. During the months of January, February, March and April after school tutoring and Saturday tutoring sessions are provided.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students had difficulty analyzing, inferring and responding to informational text using text-based evidence. Students had difficulty producing valid and reliable evidence-based argumentative and informative writing using mature vocabulary and proper grammatical structure.
	We will provide students with the strategies needed to increase proficiency on district and state assessments.
	Students will be utilizing the iReady program and book. We will also Fair test our students in order to acquire for more data. COHEA is implementing the Edgenuity to show data. We will also be implementing Turnitin in order to help the students with their writing.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Meet with the ELA/Reading Coaches
2. Collect data within the school in order to provide the required needs of our students
3. Once we have the data, we will analyze and collaborative conduct discussions.
4. Then use the data to work on the weakness of the students.
4. Create the groups based on the needs
5. Start the push-ins and pull-outs.
6. Pre-test and post- test

Person Responsible	Graciela Carbajosa (carbajosag@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

At COHEA most of our students are ELL, we will continue to work closing with the learning gaps and provide adequate instructional strategies. We also purchased Vocabulary.com to enhance our student's vocabulary. The Leadership Team will meet monthly to discuss and to analyze the data and continue to implement strategies for our ELL students.

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.

COHEA's school culture includes an atmosphere of mutual respect among all stakeholders where teaching and learning are valued, achievements and successes are celebrated, and ongoing collaboration is a must. We take priority on creating a healthy school culture.

We have a strong EESAC Team, which consist of Administrators, teachers, parents, business partners and students. Together we make decision that are in the best interest of our school. Collaboration is essential in our school, with every stakeholder within our school.

Our school's Activities Director (AD) and our Community Involvement Specialist (CIS), reaches out to our community in order to secure our partnerships.The AD invites the businesses to our Family Day at school as well as various events at our school. We provide parent academies to teach parents how to utilize technology, know what their children are being tested on, as well other educational help that the parents can utilize.

Our students must complete 75 hours of community services within our community.

COHEA has adopted the Youth Crime Watch Program, in which our trust counselor leads this program for our students. The Youth Crime Watch is a crime- and drug-prevention program. This program provides a forum for discussing drug and crime prevention, establishing communication and reporting systems, and engaging in community networking.

We also conduct 3 times a year, a STEM Night, which involves all stakeholders the parents, students, business partners, teachers, and the community.

To continue improving our school culture we have added the "Leader In Me" to our school. The Leader In Me helps create well-rounded learners by developing the whole-person and preparing students to become life-ready leaders. Leader in Me unites students, staff and families around a common goal to prepare students with college, career, and life-readiness skills that are necessary to thrive in our environment.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$27,353.25
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			7262 - City Of Hialeah Educational Academy	General Fund		$13,353.25
			Notes: Spring Board for Math			
			7262 - City Of Hialeah Educational Academy	General Fund		$14,000.00
			Notes: Edgenuity was purchased for both Math and ELA			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: ELA Learning Gains				$5,257.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			7262 - City Of Hialeah Educational Academy	General Fund		$3,395.00
			Notes: Turnitin for ELA is a text-matching software which is designed to educate students regarding appropriate citation and referencing techniques.			
			7262 - City Of Hialeah Educational Academy	General Fund		$1,862.00
			Notes: Vocabulary.com is a platform for lifelong learners, growing every step of the way. Vocabulary.com was designed for students to improve their academic vocabulary.			
					Total:	**$32,610.25**