Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Here's Help



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	14
1 OSILIVE CUITATE & ETIVITOTIMENT	
Budget to Support Goals	15

Here's Help

15100 NW 27TH AVE, Opa Locka, FL 33054

outreach.dadeschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Theron Clark

Start Date for this Principal: 8/30/2020

	T
2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
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)	
	2018-19: No Grade
	2017-18: No Grade
School Grades History	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 in	nformation, <u>click here</u> .

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:

- 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	15

Here's Help

15100 NW 27TH AVE, Opa Locka, FL 33054

outreach.dadeschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 7-12	No	%

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

Grade

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Foster relationships with community partners in order to provide wrap-around services to successfully meet the diverse needs of EAOP students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We strive to find this common ground and assist with eradicating the school house to jail house pipeline, which is so prevalent in our communities through innovation, opportunity and access.

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
lber, Alberto	Principal	Provides instructional leadership to faculty and staff to promote academic excellence, foster collaboration to support a positive school climate, and coordinate all school resources to ensure all stakeholders are equipped with the means to deliver quality educational programs to our students.
Nortelus, Joella	Instructional Coach	Provides assistance with the coordination and implementation of research-based instructional practices via the coaching model (planning, demonstrating, providing feedback) based on student need as determined by student assessment data.
Antonini, Enrique	Instructional Coach	Provides assistance with the coordination and implementation of research-based instructional practices via the coaching model (planning, demonstrating, providing feedback) based on student need as determined by student assessment data.
Alonso, Nadeshka	Administrative Support	Collects and analyzes school-wide assessment data to design and implement progress monitoring tools to inform instructional decisions and practices.
Perez de Ayllon, Nidia	Other	Provides specialized knowledge and skills related to student-centered learning processes, techniques of assessment of learning and social adjustment, research design, and modification of behaviors to improve social and academic outcomes for students.
Lafaille, Eddy	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 8/30/2020, Theron Clark

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

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
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)	
	2018-19: No Grade
	2017-18: No Grade
School Grades History	2016-17: No Grade
	2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Informat	ion*
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	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/30/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator						Gr	ade	e Le	vel					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	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						Gr	ade	e Le	evel					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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:

In dia stan						Gr	ade	e Le	vel					Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	

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 Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State		
ELA Achievement	0%	59%	56%	0%	56%	53%		
ELA Learning Gains	0%	54%	51%	0%	51%	49%		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	48%	42%	0%	45%	41%		

School Grade Component		2019		2018				
School Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State		
Math Achievement	0%	54%	51%	0%	47%	49%		
Math Learning Gains	0%	52%	48%	0%	47%	44%		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	51%	45%	0%	45%	39%		
Science Achievement	0%	68%	68%	0%	63%	65%		
Social Studies Achievement	0%	76%	73%	0%	71%	70%		

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey												
Indicator		Grade	Level (pri	or year re	ported)		Total					
indicator	7	8	9	10	11	12	Iotai					
	(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
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Com	parison					
08	2019					
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	58%	-58%
Cohort Com	parison	0%				
09	2019	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Same Grade C	omparison	0%				
Cohort Com	parison	0%				
10	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Same Grade C	omparison	0%			•	
Cohort Com	parison	0%			•	

	MATH													
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison								
07	2019													
	2018													
Cohort Com	nparison													
08	2019													
	2018	0%	38%	-38%	45%	-45%								
Cohort Com	nparison	0%												

	SCIENCE													
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison								
08	2019													
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	50%	-50%								
Cohort Con	nparison													

		BIOLO	GY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus	State	School Minus
rear	School	District	District	State	State
2019	0%	68%	-68%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	65%	-65%
Co	ompare	0%			
		CIVIC	S EOC		
			School		School
Year	School	District	Minus	State	Minus
			District		State
2019					
2018					
		HISTO	RY EOC		
			School		School
Year	School	District	Minus	State	Minus
			District		State
2019	0%	71%	-71%	70%	-70%
2018					
		ALGEB	RA EOC		
			School		School
Year	School	District	Minus	State	Minus
			District		State
2019	0%	63%	-63%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	59%	-59%	62%	-62%
Co	ompare	0%			
		GEOME	TRY EOC		
			School		School
Year	School	District	Minus	State	Minus
			District		State
2019	0%	54%	-54%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Co	ompare	0%			

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			
HSP														
FRL														

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)				
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students				
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students				
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target				
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency				
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index				
Total Components for the Federal Index				
Percent Tested				
Subgroup Data				
Students With Disabilities				

Subgroup Data				
Students With Disabilities				
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities				
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?				
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%				
English Language Learners				
Federal Index - English Language Learners				
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?				
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%				
Native American Students				
Federal Index - Native American Students				
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?				
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%				
Asian Students				

Federal Index - Asian Students

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	0			
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 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	0			
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?				
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%				

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.

Previous year incomplete

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

Previous year incomplete

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.

Previous year incomplete

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

Previous year incomplete

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

Previous year incomplete

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

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School-wide use of the different platforms to be used for distance learning. The team will address this by both physically and digitally having reoccurring meetings.

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.

By having the SLT create positive connection with their team.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

Total:	\$0.00
	• • • • •