

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Neva King Cooper Educational Center



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Neva King Cooper Educational Center

151 NW 5TH ST, Homestead, FL 33030

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Tracy Roos**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/27/2020

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>PK-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Special Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 77%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) |  |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: No Grade<br>2017-18: No Grade<br>2016-17: No Grade<br>2015-16: No Grade |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | CS&I   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## 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](http://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

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Neva King Cooper Educational Center

151 NW 5TH ST, Homestead, FL 33030

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

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School<br>PK-12                      | Yes                    | %  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| Special Education                                | No                     | %  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2011-12 |
|-------|---------|
| Grade | 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.

The mission of Neva King Cooper Educational Center is to give all our students the tools needed to communicate independently, enhance normalization, and grow/develop to their maximum potential. This will take place through the use of assisted technology, an individualized curriculum, and the assistance of our greatest asset, our stakeholders.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Neva King Cooper Educational Center is committed to providing innovative learning experiences and educational excellence to all.

### 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  |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Roos, Tracy      | Principal           | Principal, Dr. Roos serves as the school's instructional leader. She 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. Dr. Roos establishes high expectations for all students and ensures that the school-based team is implementing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). |
| Sachs, Holly     | Teacher, ESE        | As an instructor and department chair, Ms. Sachs serves as the liaison to the leadership team for her grade level and supports the implementation of the MTSS process.   |
| Placido, Melissa | Other               | As the electives department chair, Ms. Placido serves as the liaison to the leadership team for her department and supports the implementation of the MTSS process.  |
| Forbes, Carla    | Other               | As professional development liaison and department chair, Ms. Forbes serves as the liaison to the leadership team for her grade level and supports the implementation of the MTSS process. She develops and provides professional development that address the needs of the instructional staff.   |
| English, Jodi    | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal, Alicia Fernandez assists the principal in implementing the vision and mission for Neva King Cooper Educational Center. She 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.                                 |

**Demographic Information****Principal start date**

Sunday 9/27/2020, Tracy Roos

**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**

23

**Demographic Data**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>PK-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Special Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 77%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) |  |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: No Grade<br>2017-18: No Grade<br>2016-17: No Grade<br>2015-16: No Grade |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |      |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | CS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> . |      |

## 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               | 2           | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 6  | 30 | 82 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4  | 5  | 0  | 10 |       |
| 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

Sunday 9/27/2020

### 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     | 2           | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 6  | 30 | 82    |
| 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 | 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     | 2           | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 6  | 30 | 82    |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| 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 | 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 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 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 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 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 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 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                                       |          | 20     |             |           | 23      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       |          | 8      |             |           | 10      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       |          | 36     |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       |          | 21     |             |           | 22      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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  | 7    |
| 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 |      |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 43   |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 6    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 7    |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 2    |
| 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                                 | 5    |
| 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  | 12  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 2   |
| 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                                | 9   |
| 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.**

Based on the 2018-2019 FSAA English Language Arts (ELA) data there is a significant decrease in grade 4. Twenty-five percent of the 5 students that took the FSAA English Language Arts Assessment and scored at a Level 1, as compared to the 2017-2018 where 50% of the 5 students scored a Level 1. This demonstrated a decrease of 25 percentage points. The factor that contributes to this data is the teachers need to focus on standards based instruction as well as integrating technology to the classroom instructional approach. In addition, students intellectual disabilities and lack of communication. Using appropriate instructional approach to meet student needs.

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

Based on the 2018-2019 FSAA English Language Arts (ELA) data there is a significant decrease in grade 8. Seventy percent of the students who took the FSAA English Language Arts Assessment scored at a Level 2, as compared to the 2017-2018 where 88% of the students scored a Level 2 on the FSAA ELA assessment. This demonstrated a decrease of 18 percentage points. The factor that contributes to this data is the teachers need to focus on standards based instruction as well as integrating technology to the classroom instructional approach. In addition, students intellectual disabilities and lack of communication. Using appropriate instructional approach to meet student needs.

**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 ELA data component showed the greatest gap when compared to the state. The contributing factor was the change in curricular resources and move toward standards-based planning. In addition, 4th grade began writing as an open response item.

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

Based on the 2018-2019 FSAA Mathematics Data, there is a significant improvement in students making learning gains in grade 6 Mathematics. 33% of students took the FSAA Mathematics Assessment and scored a level 2 average as compared to 2017-2018 where 20% of the students scored a Level 2 average. This demonstrated a 13-percentage point increase. Actions taken include data driven and hands-on instruction.

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

The Early Warning system identifies attendance as an area of concern. Where we have a 84% attendance rate. This EWS is significant however, many students at Neva King Cooper Educational Center are students with significant intellectual disabilities and medical needs resulting in hospitalizations and inability to attend school.

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

1. Focus on Writing Across the curriculum and vocabulary development.
2. Focusing on Standards – Based Planning ensuring students are taught and assessed in the classroom based on grade level standards.
3. Create a Positive Behavior Intervention Strategy System (PBIS) to ensure all are following a school and classroom management system that will positively impact the classroom and create a safe learning environment.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on the 2018-2019 FSAA English Language Arts (ELA) data there is a significant decrease in grade 8. Seventy percent of the students who took the FSAA English Language Arts Assessment scored at a Level 2, as compared to the 2017-2018 where 88% of the students scored a Level 2 on the FSAA ELA assessment. This demonstrated a decrease of 18 percentage points.

**Measurable Outcome:** If we continue to implement instructional practices specifically relating to standard-aligned instruction, and conduct classroom walkthroughs, then we can experience improvement in the FSAA ELA achievement as evidenced by FSAA results.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Alicia Fernandez (305789@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The evidence-based strategy include Academic Vocabulary Instruction, technology integration and differentiated instruction

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** If standard-aligned instruction facilitated through differentiated instruction, the teaching of academic vocabulary, and the integration of technology is implemented with the appropriate resources, intention and fidelity, then the percentage of students making adequate growth will increase.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Administration will provide additional professional development in standards-based planning/instruction to ensure instructional practices are focused on learning and on grade-level. In addition, classroom walkthroughs, collaborative planning and Best Practices will be the focus for all content areas,

**Person Responsible:** Tracy Roos (pr0921@dadeschools.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**The area of focus is Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned instruction. The actions needed to sustain Standard-aligned instruction which will be led by the leadership team are the following: taking ownership for students' learning and believing in students' ability to learn regardless of barriers.**

**Additionally, the leadership team will ensure that teachers are also well versed in the technology programs being implemented so that it's use is a complement to the teacher/student instruction being given as well as knowing when to make adjustments based on student data. Teachers will also be taught how to properly schedule students to take advantage of the technology provided.**

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**



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

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

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

The faculty and staff at Neva King Cooper Educational Center works rigorously to keep parents informed of their child's academic progress. Parents are provided with quarterly progress reports, report cards, and they participate in parent/teacher conferences. Team parent conferences for identified under-performing Homebound students are routinely scheduled to address their academic and behavioral needs. In addition, quarterly student progress reports are issued to all students to provide parents student's current academic performance. The school's social worker is used as a family resource to assist them with making contact and referrals to outside agencies as needed. Staff works with families and school to ensure their successful transition back to the student's home school following dismissal from Homebound placement.

Our school considers counseling for students entering the Hospitalized/Homebound program, especially those students with a psychiatric medical diagnosis. District clinicians provide counseling services to students identified through IEP team meetings to be in need of individual counseling. As needed, Functional Assessment of Behaviors (FAB) and Behavioral Intervention Plans (BIP) will be developed and implemented for identified students.

The school leadership team uses a multifaceted process to identify and align resources to meet the needs of students. The leadership team, comprised of the Principal, Assistant Principal, and Department Heads, meets weekly. The team collaborates regarding decisions impacting student performance. Adjustments are made as necessary. The Principal has ultimate responsibility for all budgetary decisions, but input from the members of the leadership team is sought and valued. The Assistant Principal is assigned to monitor the property control inventory including instructional materials and technology resources to ensure they are allocated

to maximize student performance. Most personnel are funded through state and local funds. Nutrition Program funds help provide free breakfast to all student's school-based students and free or reduced lunch to qualifying students. IDEA funds are used to support Exceptional Education students and programs.

### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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