

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

International Studies Charter High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

International Studies Charter High School

2480 SW 8TH ST, Miami, FL 33135

<http://ischs.dadeschools.net>

Demographics

Principal: Alina Lopez

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2006

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 9-12 |
| 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) | 57% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | English Language Learners Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (88%) 2017-18: A (85%) 2016-17: A (83%) 2015-16: A (72%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

International Studies Charter High School

2480 SW 8TH ST, Miami, FL 33135

<http://ischs.dadeschools.net>

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 9-12 | No | 59% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | Yes | 83% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

International Studies Charter School was established to serve the needs of the community by offering a multi-lingual, multi-literate, and multi-cultural curriculum, preparing students to be thoughtful, educated members of a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

International Studies Charter School teaches students to think and behave as citizens of the world, make decisions with integrity, and graduate with a sense of purpose.

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 |
|--------------------|------------------------|---|
| Rodriguez, Douglas | Principal | Mr. Victoriano Rodriguez is the school's principal. He is responsible for the daily operations and budget of the school. He also oversees the implementation of curriculum by the faculty, and keeps a keen eye on data trends in the school. In his capacity as the school's leader he meets on a regular basis with his administrative team to discuss school, personnel, and/or stakeholder concerns. |
| Perez, Elizabeth | Administrative Support | Ms. Elizabeth Perez serves as administrative support. She oversees school discipline. She is also the school testing chairperson and ELL program coordinator. As a result of her varied roles, she works closely with the faculty in several capacities: to support their disciplinary efforts, to train and oversee them in administering state and national examinations, and to provide them with strategies to support the school's ELL population. |
| Ruiz, Olga | Instructional Coach | Ms. Olga Ruiz is the school's instructional coach. She meets regularly with teachers to offer instructional support and strategies. Her primary aim is to help teachers refine their instruction to create innovative, engaging and targeted lessons for students at all levels. |
| Del Valle, Hector | Other | Mr. Hector Del Valle is the school's Activities and Athletics Director. He coordinates all school activities and oversees the school's clubs. He works closely with all stakeholders to plan events to build school spirit and unity. As Athletic Director he oversees all sports programming at the school. |
| Correa, Michelle | School Counselor | Ms. Michelle Correa is the school's Student Services department chairperson and College Assistance Program (CAP) Advisor. She works with the school's guidance counseling team to oversee academic progress, scheduling, and the mental health wellness of the student body. As CAP Advisor she supports students in the dual enrollment process and in the completion of college applications, and securing of financial aid/ scholarships. |
| Davalos, Javier | Teacher, K-12 | Mr. Javier Davalos is the English-Language Arts department instructional leader (department chairperson). He works closely with English department teachers to ensure department goals are met. He also reviews school data trends and curriculum needs for the department, and sees to the proper implementation of teaching strategies to support learners at all levels. |
| Rivas, Xiomara | Teacher, K-12 | Ms. Xiomara Rivas is the Mathematics instructional leader (department chairperson). She works closely with math department teachers to ensure department goals are met. She also reviews school data trends and curriculum needs for the department, and sees to the proper implementation of teaching strategies to support learners at all levels. |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Herrera, Jose | Teacher, K-12 | Mr. Jose Herrera is the Science department instructional leader (department chairperson). He works closely with science department teachers to ensure department goals are met. He also reviews school data trends and curriculum needs for the department, and sees to the proper implementation of teaching strategies to support learners at all levels. |
| Jaynes, Jennifer | Assistant Principal | Ms. Jennifer Jaynes serves as the school's assistant principal. She is the principal's "right hand" in overseeing the day-to-day at the school. She oversees the instructional leader of each content area, as well as the school's administrative support and student services team. She is directly responsible for ensuring that the school remains in compliance with all district, state, and federal guidelines. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/15/2006, Alina Lopez

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

39

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 9-12 |
| 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) | 57% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | English Language Learners Hispanic Students White Students |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (88%) 2017-18: A (85%) 2016-17: A (83%) 2015-16: A (72%) |
| 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 | 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 | 102 | 107 | 110 | 89 | 408 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 8 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 |

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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/9/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Number of students enrolled | | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | | |
| One or more suspensions | | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators | | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Retained Students: Current Year | | |
| Students retained two or more times | | |

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 | 0 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 15 | 3 | 33 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 17 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 |

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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 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 | 90% | 59% | 56% | 90% | 56% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 71% | 54% | 51% | 67% | 51% | 49% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 83% | 48% | 42% | 82% | 45% | 41% |
| Math Achievement | 93% | 54% | 51% | 85% | 47% | 49% |
| Math Learning Gains | 81% | 52% | 48% | 68% | 47% | 44% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 82% | 51% | 45% | 70% | 45% | 39% |
| Science Achievement | 87% | 68% | 68% | 86% | 63% | 65% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 100% | 76% | 73% | 91% | 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 | 85% | 55% | 30% | 55% | 30% |
| | 2018 | 90% | 54% | 36% | 53% | 37% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 89% | 53% | 36% | 53% | 36% |
| | 2018 | 90% | 54% | 36% | 53% | 37% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |

| 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 | 82% | 68% | 14% | 67% | 15% |
| 2018 | 74% | 65% | 9% | 65% | 9% |
| Compare | | 8% | | | |

| 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 | 100% | 71% | 29% | 70% | 30% |
| 2018 | 94% | 67% | 27% | 68% | 26% |
| Compare | | 6% | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 80% | 63% | 17% | 61% | 19% |
| 2018 | 91% | 59% | 32% | 62% | 29% |
| Compare | | -11% | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 93% | 54% | 39% | 57% | 36% |
| 2018 | 94% | 54% | 40% | 56% | 38% |
| Compare | | -1% | | | |

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 | 76 | 72 | 78 | 93 | 93 | 92 | 85 | 100 | | 97 | 86 |
| HSP | 92 | 72 | 88 | 94 | 80 | 83 | 86 | 100 | | 99 | 92 |
| WHT | 82 | 69 | 75 | 84 | 86 | | 88 | 100 | | 100 | 100 |
| FRL | 91 | 73 | 87 | 95 | 84 | 85 | 86 | 100 | | 100 | 90 |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| ELL | 78 | 63 | 62 | 94 | 89 | | | 92 | | 93 | 92 |
| HSP | 92 | 61 | 74 | 95 | 76 | 93 | 77 | 95 | | 97 | 90 |
| WHT | 95 | 63 | 77 | 86 | 91 | 90 | | 96 | | 100 | 95 |
| FRL | 93 | 60 | 74 | 93 | 76 | 93 | 73 | 95 | | 97 | 92 |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| ELL | 85 | 63 | 76 | 81 | 75 | 78 | 85 | 81 | | 89 | 100 |
| HSP | 91 | 69 | 87 | 85 | 66 | 69 | 87 | 91 | | 93 | 91 |
| WHT | 91 | 61 | 71 | 82 | 71 | 71 | 90 | 95 | | 93 | 96 |
| FRL | 88 | 64 | 79 | 86 | 69 | 72 | 85 | 90 | | 90 | 89 |

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 | 89 |
| 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 | 94 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 974 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| 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 | 88 |
| 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 | 88 |
| 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 | 89 |
| 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 school's lowest data component was ELA Learning Gains. Although there was a significant increase in learning gains compared to prior year data (from 61% in 2018 to 71% in 2019) it is still an opportunity for improvement. This is a trend that has held for several years, though the data is beginning to trend upwards. It should be noted, the school has significantly strong performance on ELA Achievement as a whole. Thus, higher performing students may not demonstrate as great gains as easily other students.

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

The greatest decline is reflected in the performance of the Math Lowest 25th Percentile, which dropped 10 percentage points between years. Upon closer investigation, the math department was not implementing strategies effectively to meet the needs of all learners. In addition, tools such as IXL were implemented with varying degrees of fidelity, resulting in inconsistent student performances throughout the school year. This has since been addressed; as of last school year, the math department meets regularly to assess data and trends across assessments and learning tools to ensure consistency. Student use is much more "stable" and is reflected in student classroom performance.

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 school has outperformed the state average across all areas. However, the data component in which the school performed the closest to state averages is in the area of Science achievement with the school outperforming the state by a margin of 19 percentage points (87% compared to the state's 68%). This may be explained by some changes within the department over the past few years. It is worth noting, however, that Science achievement increased between school years. The school invested in USA Test Prep to help support student learning on the Biology EOC, and the results have been favorable.

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

Although it is the area in which the school performed closest to the state, Science Achievement is the area of greatest improvement. There was an increase of 12 percentage points between tested years (from 75% in 2018 to 87% in 2019). This is likely because the school invested in USA Test Prep to support student learning on the Biology EOC. The tool was implemented consistently with students.

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

An area of concern is the number of students failing a math course during the school year (no students failed an ELA course in the previous year; total reflective only of mathematics). These students are likely to continue to struggle with the subject throughout high school if appropriate supports and targeted instruction are not provided. Given that the performance of the lowest 25th percent in math is an area that experienced decline in prior years, it is vital to address this group, as their progress is reflected in the school's overall performance.

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

1. To continue to increase ELA Learning Gains.
2. To increase the performance of the lowest 25th percentile on Math assessments.
3. To support students in the adjustment between in-person and distance learning and ensure their general wellness.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA Learning Gains are a primary area of focus as it has consistently been a lower performing component for several years. Given that many state and national examinations are data-based, strengthening student performance on the ELA exams (and specifically learning gains) can support student learning and performance across all disciplines to some extent. As such, the school will focus on the skills involved in this area to boost student achievement.

Measurable Outcome: The school aims to increase ELA Learning Gains by at least four percentage points, from 71% to 75%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Javier Davalos (jdavalos@ischs.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Results from the FAIR/PMRN will be closely monitored to identify 1) struggling students and 2) areas of concern. In addition, the teachers will receive training in differentiated instruction. Armed with these techniques, the teachers will be better equipped to target and address student needs to support all learners. Beyond this, there is a school-wide initiative to have writing across the curriculum throughout the school year. Prior to the commencement of the school year, assigned department members (overseen by the principal and Mr. Davalos) have trained the faculty on writing and critical reading strategies as applicable in all subject areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The FAIR/PMRN is a recognized and vetted method of monitoring student progress; the data gleaned will drive instruction and clearly identify student needs. In addition, the effectiveness of differentiated instruction is well documented (if implemented with fidelity), and can provide all learners a path to academic achievement. Finally, given the increasing amounts of evidence-based reading on ELA assessments, focusing on writing across all curriculum encourages students to think about all disciplines critically as they write. This initiative will support the teaching strategies of the English department and reinforce the skills students are taught in their English classes. Writing requires critical thinking and analysis of source material, which can lead to stronger reading and writing performance.

Action Steps to Implement

The ELA instructional leader will analyze and discuss PMRN data with the department at department meetings. Together, they will identify student areas of concern/need, and work on targeting lessons to support student learning/achievement.

Person Responsible Javier Davalos (jdavalos@ischs.net)

The administration will provide professional development on differentiated instruction. The instructional coach will review lesson plans and conduct classroom visits to ensure that techniques are being implemented in the classroom.

Person Responsible Olga Ruiz (oruiz@ischs.net)

The ELA instructional leader and assigned department members trained the faculty on writing across the curriculum. The training included reading and writing strategies to support student learning.

Person Responsible Javier Davalos (jdavalos@ischs.net)

The principal and assistant principal will review teacher lesson plans and assignments to ensure alignment with the faculty training.

Person Responsible Jennifer Jaynes (jjaynes@ischs.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The school will focus on increasing the percentage of students achieving mastery from the lowest 25 percentile in mathematics. Based on previous state assessment data, there was a drop of 10 percentage points (from 92% to 82%) in this population. In addition, the mathematics department has observed an overall decrease in the use of practice/monitoring tools, such as IXL by this same demographic. This negatively impacts overall student achievement in mathematics throughout high school, and increases the likelihood that a student will fail a mathematics course. In fact, the highest number of course failures in the high school were in mathematics courses.

Measurable Outcome:

The school plans to increase mathematics achievement of the lower quartile from 82% to at least 85%. Concurrently, the school plans to see an increase of 8 percentage points (when compared to last year's data among the lower 25th percentile on use of the practice tool IXL to support student learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Xiomara Rivas (xrivas@ischs.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The Mathematics department will utilize IXL practices and diagnostics to support all students in math. The program provides specialized reports which can highlight the lowest performing students, track their progress over time, and identify specific problem areas within a math subject. In addition, the teachers will receive training on differentiated instruction to better meet the needs of all learners.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

IXL is a thoroughly vetted and reliable support tool for teachers and students. When implemented and used with fidelity, it supports instruction and can lead to direct improvements in student performance. Furthermore, the program generates student specific and whole class data, which helps the teacher plan targeted lessons to address trouble areas in mathematics. The success and effectiveness of differentiated instruction is well-documented. Utilizing varied instructional techniques should help students at all levels better grasp material and demonstrate their learning on assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

The Mathematics department will train on the effective use of IXL tools and diagnostics at the start of the school year. They will meet monthly (at minimum) to discuss their data findings and review the diagnostic tool and adjust instruction as needed.

Person Responsible

Xiomara Rivas (xrivas@ischs.net)

The administration will review the department data with the Mathematics department chairperson to oversee program implementation and determine if student trends are indicative of proper instructional strategies.

Person Responsible

Douglas Rodriguez (drodriguez@doral.edu)

The administration will provide professional development on differentiated instruction. The instructional coach will review lesson plans and conduct classroom visits to ensure that techniques are being implemented in the classroom.

Person Responsible

Olga Ruiz (oruiz@ischs.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Given the current circumstances due to COVID-19, students have participated in distance learning since March 2020. Although not measurable in the traditional sense, leadership is aware that distance learning can increase feelings of isolation from peers. The school leadership team has worked together in an effort to continue to support student learning, and to provide social activities, that contribute to general wellness and inclusion in the school community (even if virtual). Students (and parents) have been reminded via orientations and social media that counselors are on hand to support anyone who is struggling emotionally. The faculty has received training from school counselors on identifying students who may exhibit warning signs that need to be addressed, and know to contact counselors when needed. In addition, the activities director has organized several events, such as orientations , to kick off the year. School clubs have commenced meetings (albeit on the virtual platform) and a Club Fair is scheduled for all interested students. Furthermore, students have been invited to participate in spirit activities by dressing up according to a theme on an assigned date. There are also already plans to host virtual pep rallies, quiz bowls, and cultural fairs (e.g., Hispanic Heritage Month events). Upon return to the school building, counselors will be available to assist any student in the transition back to school. The commencement of more traditional activities (while following health protocols) will resume immediately upon return to welcome students and increase their sense of belonging within the school community.

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.

The school recognizes the vital role that families and the community play in its success. Parents are welcomed into the International Studies Charter School (ISCS) family with an orientation prior to the commencement of the school year (new parents are the primary audience, but all families are welcome). The orientation serves as an introduction to the school's history, culture, mission, vision, administrative and student services team members, and yearly goals. Student "Eagle Ambassadors" and several staff members are in attendance to welcome parents and answer any questions they may have about the school. In addition, the school's Parent-Teacher-Student Organization (PTSO) and partner consulate organizations (French, Italian, Spanish) join in to support the school and encourage parent participation. In the event a family cannot attend the orientation, or cannot join a parent group such as the PTSO, they can still receive updates about the school via Open House, the school website, school messenger updates, and social media.

Once a student joins the ISCS family the school continues to encourage open lines of communication.

Teachers are diligent about connecting with parents of students who may need additional support. The school offers free “in-house” tutoring (even during distance learning) in all disciplines. Parents, students, or teachers who feel that a child needs additional learning or emotional support have access to guidance counselors when needed, as well. Apart from this, the school employs a full-time College Advisor who assists families in navigating dual enrollment opportunities, college applications, financial aid, and scholarships.

ISCS also has strong community connections. The school works closely with two college partners (Miami-Dade College and Doral College) to offer students dual enrollment opportunities, as well as access to cultural/academic extracurricular activities. Apart from this, the school encourages all clubs to have at least one neighborhood partner to work with (often via volunteer work). The school leadership team finds that this empowers students to be agents of change in their community and, in turn, the community partners have opportunities to share with the students and school. Beyond fulfilling a service requirement, these partnerships teach students to think beyond themselves to fulfill the school’s goal of creating global citizens.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.