

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Ruth Owens Kruse Education Center



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ruth Owens Kruse Education Center

11001 SW 76TH ST, Miami, FL 33173

<http://rok.dadeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Ora Whitehead R

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ruth Owens Kruse Education Center

11001 SW 76TH ST, Miami, FL 33173

<http://rok.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)
Combination School PK-12	Yes	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year	2011-12	2011-12	2011-12	2011-12
Grade				D

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.

The mission of Ruth Owens Kruse Educational Center is to create an environment that fosters individual students' mastery of life skills through: an integrated academic curriculum, the use technology, a comprehensive behavioral program and therapeutic service encompassing school, family, and community partnerships.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our school supports students in their quest to maximize academic, social, and behavioral functioning in order for them to become contributing members of society.

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
Whitehead, Ora	Principal	Principal, Ms.Whitehead: As the school's instructional leader, Ms. Whitehead provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. Data is utilized to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Ms. Whitehead establishes high expectations for all students and ensures that the school-based team is implementing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS).
Rubio, Joseph	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, Joseph Rubio assists the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. He ensures the fidelity of the MTSS model by monitoring and evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development with faculty needs.
Lewis, Tuwanna	Other	As an instructor and grade level chair, Ms. Lewis acts as the liaison for her grade level and supports the implementation of the MTSS process.
Love, Mamie	Teacher, K-12	As an instructor and grade level chair, Ms. Love serves as the liaison for her grade level and supports the implementation of the MTSS process.
Anteen, Joy	Teacher, ESE	
Roldan, Eileen	Teacher, K-12	As an instructor and Science chair, Ms. Roldan serves as the liaison for her grade level and supports the implementation of the MTSS process.
Lantigua, Adriel	Teacher, ESE	As an instructor and Math chair, Mr. Lantigua serves as the liaison for her grade level and supports the implementation of the MTSS process.
Schaub, Lorraine	Teacher, ESE	As an instructor and Language Arts chair, Ms. Schaub serves as the liaison for her grade level and supports the implementation of the MTSS process.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/10/2020, Ora Whitehead R

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

13

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 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	2	3	7	10	7	13	10	14	14	10	35	125	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	3	5	1	8	9	11	7	9	10	19	83	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	6	5	3	1	30	
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	2	6	5	7	8	6	7	4	0	0	45	

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	
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

Thursday 8/27/2020

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	2	3	7	10	7	13	10	14	14	10	35	125	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	3	5	1	8	9	11	7	9	10	19	83	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	6	5	3	1	30	
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	2	6	5	7	8	6	7	4	0	0	45	

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	
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	

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	2	3	7	10	7	13	10	14	14	10	35	125
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	3	5	1	8	9	11	7	9	10	19	83
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	6	5	3	1	30
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	2	6	5	7	8	6	7	4	0	0	45

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	

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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	0%	60%	-60%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	64%	-64%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	58%	-58%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	18%	60%	-42%	56%	-38%
	2018	17%	59%	-42%	58%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
09	2019	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
10	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	67%	-67%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	67%	-67%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	69%	-69%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	68%	-68%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	65%	-65%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	66%	-66%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	58%	-58%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	27%	40%	-13%	46%	-19%
	2018	8%	38%	-30%	45%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		27%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	43%	-43%	48%	-48%
	2018	15%	44%	-29%	50%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	68%	-68%	67%	-67%
2018	15%	65%	-50%	65%	-50%
Compare		-15%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	73%	-73%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	72%	-72%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	18%	71%	-53%	70%	-52%
2018	33%	67%	-34%	68%	-35%
Compare		-15%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	63%	-63%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	59%	-59%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	54%	-54%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Compare		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
SWD	21	35	40	27	51	50	24	35		56	
ELL				40							
BLK	14	22		17	43						
HSP	22	46		31	61		27	50		46	
FRL	22	36	40	28	51	50	25	38		50	
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	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	333
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	24
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	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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 2019 FSA ELA data yielded 14% learning gains in 4th grade as compared to 56% for the district. This is a decreased difference of 42%.

Contributing factors : High attrition rate due to nature of school. High rate of hospitalizations and absences. Many students do not have previous year's data to be able to have a learning gain. Alignment to standards needs improvement.

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance is Algebra I EOC Learning Gains which went from 22% in 2017-2018 22% to 0% in 2018-2019 school year.

Contributing factors : High attrition rate due to nature of school. High rate of hospitalizations and absences. Many students do not have previous year's data to be able to have a learning gain. Alignment to standards needs improvement.

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 data component that had the greatest gap is : Algebra I EOC Proficiency with the following:

- 2018-2019 0 %
- 2017-2018 0 %
- 2016-2017 7% (1 student)

Contributing factors : High attrition rate due to nature of school. High rate of hospitalizations and absences.

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

The 2019 FSA Math data yielded 67% learning gains in 5th grade as compared to 49% for the district. This is an increased of 18%.

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

One potential area of concern indicated by the data is that during the students the 2019-2020 school year over 74% of student had 18 or more absences.

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

1. Improved attendance
2. ELA Learning Gains for grades 4-10
3. ELA proficiency for grades 3-10
4. Algebra 1 EOC Learning gains
5. FSA Mathematics Grades 4-10

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus is in our commitment to student by providing staff with the appropriate resources to address the needs of the student. The school is committed to the improvement of all students as it related to academics, behavioral, and emotional growth.
Measurable Outcome:	If PBIS is successfully implement, Family Engagement, and Mindfulness, then there will be a decrease in the number of students receiving disciplinary action due to behavioral disruptions, increase family participation and student achievement, and a decrease in student and staff anxiety for the 2020-21 school year. success.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ora Whitehead (owwhitehead@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ruth Owens Krusé Educational Center will continue to use curriculum and resources effectively in Math and Language Arts to ensure that students maintain learned skills and acquire new grade level proficiency. Teachers will utilize checking for understanding and corrective feedback strategies to monitor student learning. Data from various areas to include, iReady, MYA, Topic Tests, Reading Plus and teacher made assessments will be analyzed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Ruth Owens Krusé Educational Center will increase the effectiveness of the school-wide level system to include a consistent use of tangible reinforcers, use of the point system, following the established protocols, weekly team reinforcers, weekly ROK shop visits, school-wide fun Friday, school-wide level up ceremony, and recognition activities.

Action Steps to Implement

Conduct a review of PBIS strategies and procedures during distance learning.

Person Responsible Khalilah Samuel (ksamuel@dadeschools.net)

Conduct a quarterly review of PBIS and analyze individual student behavioral data trends.

Person Responsible Khalilah Samuel (ksamuel@dadeschools.net)

Team leaders will attend Mindful training and share strategies during team meetings on "Mindful Thursdays". A "Mindful Room" will be created for students to refocus and re-energize themselves in order to return to the learning environment.

Person Responsible Khalilah Samuel (ksamuel@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will conduct quarterly data chats with standard curriculum students, including but not limited to the following subgroup: Black, Hispanic, Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners, to provide students with areas of needed growth and increase student ownership of learning.

Person Responsible Ora Whitehead (owwhitehead@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Ruth Owens Kruse Educational Center will continue to monitor student progress in Math and Language Arts to ensure that students maintain learned skills and acquire new grade level proficiency. Teachers will utilize various strategies and incentives to encourage and motivate student performance. Teachers will assessments such as i-Ready math and reading, MYA, Topic Tests, Reading Plus and teacher made assessment to monitor student progress and provide corrective feedback.

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 Ruth Owens Kruse Educational Center we collaborate and build partnerships with local businesses that serve as our community partners. These partners offer support through donations to our token economy system and various school projects. The community partners also assist us with job shadowing opportunities so that students may learn skills needed for future employment. Students also have the opportunity to participate in Community Based Vocational Education programs (CBVE) where students can practice the skills needed to transition to the community and independent living. Students participate in community projects that are fostered through volunteer services at the Homeless Assistance Center, Publix, and Cici's Pizza. Community partners are also part of our Educational Excellence School Advisory Committee (EESAC), and attend meetings so that they may offer support needed.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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