

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

International Studies Charter Middle 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	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

International Studies Charter Middle 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)	Middle School 6-8
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)	61%
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 (86%) 2017-18: A (80%) 2016-17: A (80%) 2015-16: A (79%)
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 Middle 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)
Middle School 6-8	No	63%
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 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. He also serves as the school's Athletic Director. In this capacity 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, once at the high school level, 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)	Middle School 6-8
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)	61%
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 (86%) 2017-18: A (80%) 2016-17: A (80%) 2015-16: A (79%)
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	105	108	106	0	0	0	0	319	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	3	0	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	6	3	0	0	0	0	20

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	94%	58%	54%	91%	53%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	77%	58%	54%	68%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	78%	52%	47%	74%	48%	44%
Math Achievement	95%	58%	58%	92%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	84%	56%	57%	75%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	84%	54%	51%	80%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	87%	52%	51%	84%	50%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	97%	74%	72%	95%	70%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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	84%	58%	26%	54%	30%
	2018	78%	53%	25%	52%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	84%	56%	28%	52%	32%
	2018	90%	54%	36%	51%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	97%	60%	37%	56%	41%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	84%	59%	25%	58%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	84%	58%	26%	55%	29%
	2018	84%	56%	28%	52%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	85%	53%	32%	54%	31%
	2018	89%	52%	37%	54%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	99%	40%	59%	46%	53%
	2018	87%	38%	49%	45%	42%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	85%	43%	42%	48%	37%
	2018	73%	44%	29%	50%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	68%	-68%	67%	-67%
2018	89%	65%	24%	65%	24%
Compare		-89%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	90%	73%	17%	71%	19%
2018	95%	72%	23%	71%	24%
Compare		-5%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	63%	36%	61%	38%
2018	90%	59%	31%	62%	28%
Compare		9%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	54%	-54%	57%	-57%
2018	100%	54%	46%	56%	44%
Compare		-100%			

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	85	68	71	92	72	79	74	89	75		
HSP	93	76	76	96	86	88	88	96	75		
WHT	93	85	81	89	77	75	92		96		
FRL	92	73	74	94	82	83	87	96	75		
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	65	64	59	81	67	82			67		
HSP	90	69	67	92	71	77	87	97	82		
WHT	82	71	58	89	67	92	61	94	77		
FRL	87	68	62	91	70	78	81	96	80		
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	71	71	73	79	77	83	78	85	57		
HSP	91	69	73	94	78	83	87	98	58		
WHT	87	67	79	84	67	67	72	80	71		
FRL	91	69	73	94	76	81	83	96	56		

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	86
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	84
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	860
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	79
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	87

Hispanic Students	
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	86
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	85
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 data component that shows the lowest performance rate is that of Learning Gains in ELA. Although there was an improvement of 7 percentage points from 2018 to 2019 (70% to 77%, respectively) it is still the school's overall lowest performance area. This has been the school's lowest data component for the past few school years but, once targeted, the data is has been trending upwards (demonstrating increasing levels of learning gains in ELA) for the last two school years. The upwards trend is likely in connection to consistent ELA teacher support by an instructional coach, as well as the use of programs such as iReady to support student learning.

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

From year to year there was no decline, as there was either improvement between years or the same rate of achievement (i.e., the 97% in Social Studies between years, which is already strong). Apart from this, Math Achievement grew only by 4% from 2018 to 2019. There were changes in instructional staff that year, and programs, such as iReady, were not implemented with fidelity by all teachers at the time.

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 consistently outperforms the state in all categories. With that said, the area in which the school performed the closest to state averages is ELA Learning Gains (the school outperformed the state by 23 percentage points). This has been an opportunity for improvement for the past several school years, and the last two school years have shown consistent improvement in this area.

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

The data component with the greatest improvement is in Math Learning Gains, increasing 14 percentage points from 2018 to 2019 (70% to 84%, respectively). Perhaps the greatest action was in doing what the school has done for several years : maintained consistent use of tools (such as iReady to support and monitor student progress. In addition, the math department chairperson (like other department chairpersons) meets with administration for a critical analysis of data trends and opportunities for improvement throughout the school year. There are also several free, in-house, tutoring opportunities conducted by math teachers and student leaders. The math department also works closely together regularly to determine how best to target student needs at all levels.

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

The number of students earning a Level 1 on the Math and ELA assessments across the grades (24 and 26 respectively) was strikingly high, as is the number of students with a course failure in math. This serves as a reminder that support and monitoring programs (such as iReady, and in-house tutoring) need to be implemented and used with fidelity over the course of the school year. In addition, teachers will receive additional training on differentiated instruction to identify and target student needs to make sure ALL learners are given the tools for success.

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

1. To target ELA skills across the curriculum to increase ELA achievement and overall learning gains.
2. To implement support and monitoring programs in Math with fidelity to increase achievement, learning gains, and to lower the number of overall Math course failures.
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: The area in which the school performs the closest to the state is ELA Learning Gains (the school outperforms the state by 23% points). This is an opportunity for improvement. 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 three percentage points, from 77% to 80%.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: The English-Language Arts department chairperson will work closely with his department to implement strategies 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: 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 ELA department and reinforce the skills students are taught in their ELA 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 department chairperson 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 Douglas Rodriguez (drodriguez@doral.edu)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	One of the highest areas of course failures and Level 1 achievement on FSA was that of Mathematics. Upon further investigation it became clear that 1) departmental changes affected the rate of success of some students, 2) support and monitoring programs such as iReady were not implemented consistently by all teachers and from year to year, and 3) some teachers were offering minimal differentiated instruction. Since much of math scaffolds from year to year, it is vital that the school take corrective action so that students do not continue to struggle with math as they go further in their academic career.
Measurable Outcome:	The school will increase Math Achievement by 4 percentage points (from 4% to 8%). In kind, the school will aim to support struggling learners and lower the number of overall Math course failures by about half (from 11 students to 5).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Xiomara Rivas (xrivas@ischs.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The school will utilize iReady to monitor student progress and provide supports. The Math instructional leader (Ms. Rivas) and the administration will ensure that the program is being used by all teachers correctly and consistently. Apart from this, there will be a training on differentiated instruction to help teachers learn new strategies for reaching all learners effectively.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady is a thoroughly vetted and reliable program to monitor student progress in Math. The school has used it for several years, and has had success with students. We expect that, when implemented fully again, we will see stronger student performance. Apart from this, it is well-documented that differentiated instruction is an effective technique to increase learning and student achievement. If all Math teachers implement differentiated instructional strategies in their classes we expect students to perform better overall and have higher rates of success.

Action Steps to Implement

The Math instructional leader will oversee the implementation of iReady by all teachers in the department. During department meetings the team will review and discuss data findings and work together to identify areas of concern and work on targeted plans to meet student needs.

Person Responsible Xiomara Rivas (xrivas@ischs.net)

The administration will meet regularly with the Math instructional leader to review data and to note the learning trends (areas of strength vs. opportunities for improvement). In addition, administration will ensure that teachers receive training on differentiated instruction techniques.

Person Responsible Douglas Rodriguez (drodriguez@doral.edu)

The instructional coach will review Math department lesson plans and conduct class visits to ensure that differentiated instruction techniques are being implemented in all classes.

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.