

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Dorothy M. Wallace Cope Center



2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| R.A.I.S.E | 0 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |

Dorothy M. Wallace Cope Center

10225 SW 147TH TER, Miami, FL 33176

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

Demographics

Principal: Tammy Edouard

Start Date for this Principal: 1/18/2018

| | |
|--|--|
| 2021-22 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Function (per accountability file) | Alternative |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 6-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Alternative Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | |
| School Improvement Rating History | 2021-22: Commendable 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Commendable 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: Maintaining |
| DJJ Accountability Rating | 2023-24: No Rating |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Dorothy M. Wallace COPE Center's mission is to provide teen parents with an education that fosters responsible parenting and self-sufficiency.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Dorothy M. Wallace COPE Center's vision is to prepare students to be effective decision-makers and productive citizens.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

Dorothy M. Wallace COPE Center is a Miami-Dade County Public Alternative School for teen parents utilizing the standard curriculum while providing extensive wraparound services that include parenting classes, social and emotional support, small class size, and a fully staffed nurturing center.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Edouard, Tammy | Principal | The principal runs the daily operations of the school while ensuring academic policies and curriculum are followed and teachers are using strategies that maximize student learning. The principal also provides an atmosphere where all stakeholders are welcome and afforded the opportunity to reach their fullest potential in order to support the mission and vision of the school. |
| Gayden, Angela | Teacher, K-12 | Math and Science Department Chair is responsible for oversight and dissemination of data to team members. Leadership team member responsible for sharing pertinent information between administration and math and science teachers. |
| Jenkins, Ruby | Teacher, K-12 | English Language Arts, Reading, and Career and Technical Education Department Chair responsible for oversight and dissemination of data to team members. Leadership team member responsible for sharing pertinent information between administration and English Language Arts, Reading, and Career and Technical Education teachers. |
| Quick, Argentina | Teacher, K-12 | Child Care Specialist responsible for oversight of the daily operation of the Nurturing Center which provides services for our students' infants and toddlers. Disseminates information and provides support and guidance to paraprofessionals who work in the Nurturing Center. Also serves as Gradebook manager. |
| Quinn, Tarika | School Counselor | Responsible for serving in the capacity of Principal's Designee, School Site Assessment Coordinator and School Counselor. |
| Gilbert, Constance | Instructional Media | Responsible for media technology, Dade Partners and school volunteers. Works to provide support for reading initiatives in the school. Literacy Leadership Team leader. |
| James-Bodie, Latasha | Other | Responsible for supporting students social and emotional well being as well as monitoring attendance. Serves as the leader on the school Attendance Review Committee, conducting home visits and providing resources and referrals as needed. School site Mindfulness Champion and Social and Emotional Lead as well as the school Activities Director. |

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 1/18/2018, Tammy Edouard

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

11

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

13

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

32

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

0

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

0

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 32 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 26 |
| 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 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 22 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 8 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 15 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 16 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 26 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 10 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/19/2021

2020-21 - 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 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 18 | 4 | 46 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 25 | |
| 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 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 20 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 15 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 16 | |

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 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 24 | |

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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 9 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 |

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

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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | | 59% | 56% | | 59% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | | 54% | 51% | | 56% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 48% | 42% | | 51% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | | 54% | 51% | | 51% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | | 52% | 48% | | 50% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 51% | 45% | | 51% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | | 68% | 68% | | 65% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | | 76% | 73% | | 73% | 71% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 56% | -56% | 52% | -52% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 60% | -60% | 56% | -56% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 20% | 55% | -35% | 55% | -35% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 53% | -53% | 53% | -53% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -20% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 40% | -40% | 46% | -46% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 43% | -43% | 48% | -48% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 68% | -68% | 67% | -67% |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 33% | 71% | -38% | 70% | -37% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 63% | -63% | 61% | -61% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 10% | 54% | -44% | 57% | -47% |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| FRL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 10 | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 7 | 27 | | | | | | 36 | | | |
| 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 |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 0 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 0 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 1 |
| Percent Tested | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the Areas of Focus?

Low performing ESSA subgroups were monitored using i-Ready, Read180, and Common Lit for English Language Arts grades 7-12; topic tests for Algebra 1 and Geometry; USA Test Prep and topic tests for US History; and topic tests for Comprehensive Science 3 and Biology.

Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

US History is the data component that shows the most improvement. USA Test Prep and Padlet were used to increase student engagement and comprehension.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

English Language Arts and Math are the areas in greatest need of improvement. The most problematic component of these areas is the ability of students to comprehend and answer questions that have multiple parts. This is based on ongoing analysis of progress monitoring data.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

One trend that emerges is that students have difficulty in answering multiple part questions. Another trend observed is that students struggle with comprehension and the integration of ideas.

What strategies need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Dorothy M. Wallace COPE Center will implement accountability talk and collaborative data chats as tools to accelerate learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development opportunities will focus on the following areas: pacing classroom instruction, engaging all students, meaningful use of data, and implementing accountable talk.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The School Climate Survey and student data suggest that, beginning with the Leadership Team, more focus needs to be placed on systemic practices that lead to improved student outcomes. Collaboration between the principal and teachers will assist in providing more opportunities for professionals to share their leadership skills and knowledge in a manner that supports the vision and the mission of the school. Throughout this process, the Leadership team will create ownership and bring creative and innovative solutions to the forefront.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Specific measurable outcomes the school plans to achieve include 70% or greater increased learning gains in reading and math, 90% or better tested, and 90% or better graduation rates.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The outcomes will be monitored via data from Performance Matters, File Download Manager, Power BI, and other educational platforms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Edouard (pr8131@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Collaborative data chats will be implemented for this area of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Collaborative data chats will ensure that all stakeholders know and understand our school goals as well as how to monitor the data and use it for purposeful planning and assisting students and parents in understanding the data.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Train necessary stakeholders on how to access and disaggregate the data.
Create calendar and conduct data chats that coincide with progress and growth monitoring.
Set goals for achieving a commendable rating and share with all stakeholders.

Person Responsible

Ruby Jenkins (rljenkins@dadeschools.net)

Meet collaboratively to discuss the data and plan its purposeful use across subject areas.

Person Responsible

Angela Gayden (drgcdms@dadeschools.net)

Monitor the use of data to ensure it is being used to create and drive meaningful instruction.

Person Responsible

Tammy Edouard (pr8131@dadeschools.net)

Identify specific staff members to serve as leads with new initiatives, professional development, and school-wide activities.

Person Responsible

Tammy Edouard (pr8131@dadeschools.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA

This area of focus impacts our ESSA subgroups.

subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Student data and faculty input have shown that social and emotional issues have impacted student academic performance. Therefore it is necessary to provide skills necessary to manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, and make responsible decisions.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The measurable outcome will be evidenced in 70% or more students making learning gains and 50% or more students showing improved attendance.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Outcomes will be monitored via qualitative data gathered from Restorative Justice activities, You Matter! events, and wellness checks. There will also be a review of accountability talk responses to determine effectiveness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Edouard (pr8131@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Accountability talk is the evidence-based strategy used in this area of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Accountability talk allows students to comfortably and safely verbalize their ideas, thereby, allowing faculty/staff to assess well-being and provide support as needed.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Implement Restorative Justice Practices throughout the school week to improve student decision making. Conduct Attendance Review Committee meetings held weekly to review student attendance and provide support and refer to for assistance as needed.

Social Worker will conduct District mandated lessons (ie. Bullying Prevention and Be the Change) via Language Arts classes.

Person Responsible

Argentina Quick (242640@dadeschools.net)

Reward students who are demonstrating good attendance with incentive awards such as Student of the Month and Student of the Week.

Person Responsible

Marilyn Morning (morning@dadeschools.net)

Students will be highlighted on the Student Attendance Bulletin Board in the main hallway.

Person Responsible

Marilyn Morning (morning@dadeschools.net)

Recognition of students through the Do The Right Thing program and Values Matter.

Person Responsible

Constance Gilbert (cgilbert@dadeschools.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

This area of focus impacts our ESSA subgroups.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

School data indicates that students are not performing at proficiency. In addition, learning gains are not evident for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our measurable outcome is to increase English Language Arts and Math learning gains as well as EOC levels to a proficiency level of 70% or greater.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Ongoing progress monitoring will be performed using District topic tests and CommonLit assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Edouard
(pr8131@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

We will continue to use accountable talk to improve student performance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Accountable talk encourages students to engage in conversations that promote learning.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Student participation in real-world initiatives such as The Fairchild Challenge to involve students in caring for the environment and solving problems.

Monitoring student work samples reflective of accountable talk to assess understanding and growth.

Person Responsible

Angela Gayden
(drgcdms@dadeschools.net)

Using Accountable Talk across the curriculum to enhance achievement and motivation.

Person Responsible

Ruby Jenkins
(rljenkins@dadeschools.net)

Participation in nursery literacy initiatives such as Books, Babies, and Bonding to foster student achievement and growth.

Person Responsible

Argentina Quick
(242640@dadeschools.net)

Student engagement and learning through technology such as Padlet and Microsoft Teams.

Person Responsible

Ruby Jenkins
(rljenkins@dadeschools.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

This area applies to our ESSA subgroups.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Using collaborative planning will allow teachers to analyze data and instructional practices to craft more purposeful and targeted instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Using collaborative planning will increase English Language Arts and Math scores with 70% or more students making learning gains and 70% or more scoring at proficiency on EOC exams.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Collaborative planning will be monitored with walkthroughs and administrative participation.

Collaborative planning will be monitored by attendance sheets.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Edouard (pr8131@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Collaborative planning is the strategy that will be implemented as teachers share best practices, examine data, and design lesson plans.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Collaborative planning will be used to promote school wide use of research-based instructional practices and data-based instruction.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Common planning to include sharing of best practices, gradual release of responsibility model, accountability talk, data disaggregation, and the strategic use of the new curriculum, textbooks, and resources.

Common planning to share student work samples and determine next steps once data is reviewed.

Person Responsible

Tammy Edouard (pr8131@dadeschools.net)

Common planning to allow core teachers to collaborate and review data.

Collaborative lunches to allow all team members to collaborate and review data.

Person Responsible

Tarika Quinn (tcquinn@dadeschools.net)

To construct common bell ringers to aide teachers in implementing the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model.

Person Responsible

Ruby Jenkins (rljenkins@dadeschools.net)

Use of In-house surveys to determine needed supplemental resources that would enhance technology usage by instructors.

Person Responsible

Constance Gilbert
(cgilbert@dadeschools.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to

This area of focus impacts our ESSA subgroups.

all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

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.

Dorothy M. Wallace COPE Center works to build a positive school culture and environment with a focus on the social and emotional well-being of all stakeholders. This includes, but is not limited to, creating opportunities for administration, teachers, and staff to share ideas, providing nurturing classrooms, holding mental health forums and activities, opening a ZEN room, and incorporating The You Matter! Movement school-wide.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Principal and Leadership Team – work together as a cohesive leadership team that is available to provide ethical, purposeful, and supportive leadership; Instructional Personnel – independently and collaboratively create a socially and emotionally safe space to grow and learn via classroom instruction, schoolwide activities, and/or other collaborative events; Students – maintain behavior and a growth mindset that supports a safe and positive environment centered on learning in the classroom, the real-world, and during extracurricular activities; Support Staff – support school programs and activities by fostering a positive learning and work environment; Parents and Stakeholders – support school programs and activities that help create a positive school culture via volunteerism, partnerships, and planning.