

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Cope Center North



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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Cope Center North

9950 NW 19TH AVE, Miami, FL 33147

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

Demographics

Principal: Ebony Dunn N

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative 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)	
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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Cope Center North

9950 NW 19TH AVE, Miami, FL 33147

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	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	2014-15	2013-14	2009-10
Grade	F*	I	F

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.

To be the preeminent provider of the highest quality education that empowers all students to be productive lifelong learners and responsible global citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We provide a world class education for every student to ensure they are productive citizens in 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
Dunn, Ebony	Principal	As the school's instructional leader, Ms. Dunn 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. Dunn establishes high expectations for all students and ensures that the school-based team is implementing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS).
Bryant-Clayton, Monique	Instructional Media	Monique Bryant-Clayton is responsible for coordinating and facilitating interventions, implementing core content area initiatives for students, providing curriculum and technology support to teachers, and analyzing data to drive interventions.
Smith, Kecia	Other	Ms. Smith is responsible for ensuring our Nurturing Center is in compliance with all Department of Children and Family guidelines, providing all childcare professional developments, facilitating and coordinating childcare bonding opportunities with the mothers and their children, and coordinating childcare events and activities.
Jones , Lisa	Attendance/ Social Work	Ms. Jones is responsible for conducting retention and promotion data chats with students, providing professional development opportunities for instructional personnel, and providing a positive behavior support system for not only students, but the faculty and staff as well.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/13/2017, Ebony Dunn N

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

44

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative 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)	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	16	13	44	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	9	14	0	34	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	1	0	11	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	
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		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	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

Friday 8/14/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	16	13	44	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	15	15	2	48	
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	1	0	1	1	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	5	0	0	13	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	16	13	44	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	15	15	2	48	
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	1	0	1	1	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	5	0	0	13	

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

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

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	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	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 (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(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
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
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
06	2019					
	2018					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	40%	-40%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	38%	-38%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	0%	43%	-43%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	68%	-68%	67%	-67%
2018	18%	65%	-47%	65%	-47%
Compare		-18%			
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	17%	71%	-54%	70%	-53%
2018	6%	67%	-61%	68%	-62%
Compare		11%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	63%	-63%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	59%	-59%	62%	-62%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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
BLK											
FRL	15	45		17	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
BLK											
FRL	15	45		17	50						
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
BLK											
FRL	15	45		17	50						

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	25
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	127
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	96%

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	
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	0
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	25
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.

As an alternative site, the two data components utilized to calculate a School Improvement Rating are learning gains in reading and learning gains in mathematics. However, the data component that showed the lowest performance is the Biology End of Course data which revealed 18% proficiency in 2018 and 12% proficiency in 2019. The factor that contributed to this decline includes the inability to fill the position with a highly qualified instructor.

The data reveals that 62 percent of our students are in need of either meeting the ELA FSA requirement or obtaining a concordant score to graduate.

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

As an alternative site, the two data components utilized to calculate a School Improvement Rating are learning gains in reading and learning gains in mathematics. However, the data component that showed the greatest decline is the Biology End of Course data which revealed a 6-percentage point decline (18% proficiency in 2018 and 12% proficiency in 2019). The factor that contributed to this decline includes the inability to fill the position.

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.

As an alternative site, the two data components utilized to calculate a School Improvement Rating are learning gains in reading and learning gains in mathematics. However, the data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is science proficiency

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

The data component that showed the most improvement includes learning gains in Mathematics. There was a 49-percentage point increase when comparing learning gains from 2018 (25% learning gains) to learning gains in 2019 (74% learning gains) as reported by the state of Florida.

The actions taken in this area include (1) infusing hands on activities, specifically math labs, (2)

infusing a school-wide theme to motivate students, (3) implementing interventions on a daily basis, (4) infusing technology within the instructional framework that is tailored to the individual needs of each students, and (5) providing opportunities for students to review for the assessment at half day increments.

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

Two potential areas of concern include students with 18 or more absences (81%) and the number of students who are at level 1 in ELA (35%).

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

1. Decreasing the number of unexcused absences our students incur.
2. Decreasing the number of students who are not graduation ready because they are unsuccessful on the Reading portion of the Florida Standards Assessment.
3. Decreasing the number of students who are unsuccessful on the Algebra End of Course Assessment.
4. Increasing student proficiency scores on the grade 8 Science and Biology End of Course Assessment.
5. Increasing student proficiency scores on the Civics and US History End of Course Assessment.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The data reveals that 62 percent of our students are in need of either meeting the ELA FSA requirement or obtaining a concordant score to graduate.

Measurable Outcome:

If targeted differentiated instruction is implemented digitally, schoolwide then there will be an increase in the percentage of student meeting the ELA FSA requirements along with an increase percentage in students meeting the concordant score to graduate.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ebony Dunn (pr8121@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Data-driven Instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Data-Driven Decision Making is a process embedded in the culture of the school where data is used at every level to make informed decisions on what is best for students. This includes goal setting, interventions, teacher placement, course work, differentiating instruction etc.

Action Steps to Implement

Virtually, we will provide:

1. Professional development for teachers in the areas of data-driven instruction and technology implementation
2. Data chats
3. On-going progress monitoring

Person Responsible

Ebony Dunn (pr8121@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The School Leadership Team's addressed the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities and determined that we must continue to consistently use progress monitoring data to support the implementation and momentum of all intervention and enrichment programs as evidenced by programs that were launched and were not as consistently successful as they could have been. The School Leadership Team will focus on the feedback from students to ensure incentives motivate the students to consistently participate.

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.

Staff will consistently use protocol to maintain a healthy and safe school environment, communicate with stakeholders, and follow district guidelines and establish an ongoing mentorship program promoting values matter and school-wide theme initiative. Additionally, staff will consistently use protocol to maintain a healthy and safe school environment, communicate with stakeholders, and follow district guidelines and establish an ongoing mentorship program promoting values matter and school-wide theme initiative. We will continue to promote school spirit, pride, and branding when celebrating the successes of all stakeholders. These successes will be communicated with all stakeholders, including community based organizations, to promote our brand and encourage school spirit.

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.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00