Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Path Academy

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Path Academy

6300 NW 27TH AVE, Miami, FL 33147

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Alberto Iber

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-08-11
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 03-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: I (%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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

Path Academy

6300 NW 27TH AVE, Miami, FL 33147

[no web address on file]

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)
Combination School 03-12	Yes	%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18
Grade	I

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At PATH Academy, we provide a positive teaching and learning environment that is fundamental to student achievement. We create a safe orderly school in which teachers can teach and students can learn. Positive student behaviors and school cultures lead to student growth and learning as well as student success by way of high support and expectations. Our positive peer culture celebrates and promotes student empowerment with pro-social behavior, positive peer counseling, and problem solving. Our staff is trained to increase students' overall awareness in each aspect of self-discipline, self-direction, self-respect, and self-esteem.

Provide the school's vision statement.

PATH Academy seeks to correct and improve the academic and behavioral performance of ALL of our students.

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
Payne, Sabrena	Principal	Principal - Ensures that all members of the Leadership Team are focused on the school's vision and mission, effectively manages the School Leadership team to promoting collaboration and a positive school climate, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support the implementation, inform staff and parents of school-based initiatives. Other Team Members - Assist in the implementation of a strong core instruction, using a process for identifying specific student needs, provides information about core curriculum, research-based programs and materials, assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; facilitates in planning and conducting professional development on differentiating instruction and incorporating intervention activities across the curriculum, support least proficient teachers through modeling and/or co-teaching, and collaborate with teachers, administrators, regional, district and state personnel about the school's instructional programs and intervention strategies.
Iber, Alberto	Principal	Collaborates regularly, problem solves, and shares effective practices. Also assists in facilitaing the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation. Members develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/ behavior assessment and intervention approaches.
Lafaille, Eddy	Assistant Principal	Support
Antonini, Enrique	Instructional Coach	support
Wynne, Dan	Administrative Support	Support

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/25/2020, Alberto Iber

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
3

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-08-11
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 03-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: I (%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/25/2020

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	11	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	8	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	7	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	11	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	8	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	7	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	63%	61%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	61%	59%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	57%	54%	0%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	67%	62%	0%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	63%	59%	0%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	52%	0%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	56%	56%	0%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	80%	78%	0%	75%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)										Total
	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019	14%	60%	-46%	58%	-44%
	2018	7%	61%	-54%	57%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	4%	64%	-60%	58%	-54%
	2018	7%	60%	-53%	56%	-49%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	4%	60%	-56%	56%	-52%
	2018	6%	59%	-53%	55%	-49%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	5%	67%	-62%	62%	-57%
	2018	13%	67%	-54%	62%	-49%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	69%	-69%	64%	-64%
	2018	4%	68%	-64%	62%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	0%	65%	-65%	60%	-60%
	2018	6%	66%	-60%	61%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	4%	53%	-49%	53%	-49%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2017-18**	**C & C Accel 2017-18**
SWD	9										
BLK	9	13	27	2	5						
HSP	10										
FRL	9	17		2	5		5				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2015-16**	**C & C Accel 2015-16**

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	10
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	70
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	5
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	9
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	5
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	8
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The area of Reading was the lowest area of performance with 10 students, (20%), exhibiting a loss of nine points or less during the iReady Reading AP2 administration during the 2019-2020 school year. We serve an at-risk population of elementary school students who have been removed from their schools due to undesirable, disruptive, disrespectful behavior(s) demonstrated in the classroom towards Teachers and Administrative Staff alike.

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

Last year was our first, or baseline year for creating a SIP; consequently, we do not have measurable data to make the comparison. Assessments during the 2020-2021 school year we allow us to identify any decline.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

This writer is not aware of the State Average regarding iReady assessment; however, our students have consistently met or surpassed the District's average of 30%, with 30%-70% of our students showing gains in Reading in the iReady assessments.

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

Last year was our first, or baseline year for creating a SIP; consequently, we do not have measurable data to make the comparison. Assessments during the 2020-2021 school year we allow us to identify any significant improvements.

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

1. Students with one or more suspensions (Behavior)
2. Students who are Level 1 on ELA statewide assessments

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

1. Improve Reading/ELA Statewide assessment scores
2. Improve Math Statewide assessment scores
3. Improve Student Behavior
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of Reading was the lowest area of performance with 10 students, (20%), exhibiting a loss of nine points or less during the iReady Reading AP2 administration during the 2019-2020 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	90% of students enrolled will increase their performance/Learning Gains in Reading on the iReady AP3 Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sabrena Payne (sabrenapayne@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Review students' performance on assignments/assessments; conduct student data chats; utilize Differentiated Instruction DI); implement ideas/suggestions of Instructional Coaches via lessons modeled; provide additional assistance/intervention for struggling readers and SWD.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To increase student performance and learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of Math was an area of low performance in that, 7 students, (15%), exhibiting a loss of 15 points or less during the iReady Math AP2 administration during the 2019-2020 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	90% of students enrolled will increase their performance/Learning Gains in Reading on the iReady AP3 Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sabrena Payne (sabrenapayne@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Review students' performance on assignments/assessments; conduct student data chats; utilize Differentiated Instruction DI); implement ideas/suggestions of Instructional Coaches via lessons modeled; provide additional assistance/intervention for struggling students and SWD.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To increase student performance and learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The Leadership Team will address the area of focus by directing and supporting the ELA Teacher and the Math Teacher, with analyzing student data and performance, conducting student data chats, and utilizing support and modeling of the instructional coaches to facilitate meaningful instruction for our students. The Leadership Team will utilize differentiated instruction (DI) to meet the needs of struggling readers and Students with Disabilities, (SWD). The leadership Team will incentivize student performance and achievement with tangible rewards (gift cards, electronic devices, and food). Finally, the Leadership Team will ensure that small group and targeted support are provided for students who are not proficient in achieving Learning Gains.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

At PATH Academy, we provide a positive teaching and learning environment that is fundamental to student achievement. We create a safe orderly school in which teachers can teach and students can learn. Positive student behaviors and school cultures lead to student growth and learning as well as student success by way of high support and expectations. Our positive peer culture celebrates and promotes student empowerment with pro-social behavior, positive peer counseling, and problem solving. Our staff is trained to increase students' overall awareness in each aspect of self-discipline, self-direction, self-respect, and self-esteem. We focus on the TOTAL child, whereby parental contact, influence, and participation are ALL key factors in our endeavor to improve first, the child's behavior , and second, the child's academic performance.

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