

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Turner/Guilford/Knight



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	12
R.A.I.S.E	0
Positive Culture & Environment	0

Turner/Guilford/Knight

7000 NW 41ST ST, Miami, FL 33166

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Theron Clark

Start Date for this Principal: 1/4/2016

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	15%
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	
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.

To provide educational, life skills, and social-emotional services to meet the diverse needs of our students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through our educational, life skills, and social-emotional services, help students to successfully re-integrate into society.

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

The Turner Guilford Knight Correctional Center serves an inmate population of 6-12 grade students under the age of 18. Currently all middle grade students scored at Level 1 on the FSA Math and the FSA Reading. Over 60% of the 9-12 grade students (retained 9th grade students) have not passed the Algebra 1 EOC test. Over 90% of the 10-12 graders have not passed the 10th grade Reading test. More than thirty percent of the population are ESE students. The students are grouped by the correctional officers according to criteria unrelated to academics.

The faculty at Turner Guilford Knight Correctional Center is supported by the school administration, a team of instructional coaches, the ESE department, the school, and the mental health counselors.

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
Iber, Alberto	Principal	Overall supervision and support
Won, Carlos	Teacher, K-12	Instruction and school leadership
Antonini, Enrique	Instructional Coach	Instructional support
Nortelus, Joella	Instructional Coach	Instructional support
Lafaille, Eddy	Assistant Principal	Administrative support
Wynne, Dan	Administrative Support	SIP and Title I support
Tomasso, Margarita	Psychologist	School psychologist
Charles, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	ELA Teacher

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 1/4/2016, Theron Clark

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

3

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

2

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

15

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	0	0	2	4	3	1	0	10
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	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	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	4
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	1	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	2	1	1	0	0	5

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/27/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	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	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	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	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 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
07	2021					
	2019	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison						
09	2021					
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison						
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	0%	73%	-73%	71%	-71%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	71%	-71%	70%	-70%

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	0%	54%	-54%	57%	-57%

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
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											
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	3
Percent Tested	87%

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	
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%	1
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	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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?

Data was not collected to provide progress monitoring. Plans for progress monitoring included addressing reading and math deficiencies. Program infrastructure prevented consistent administration of assessments.

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

Ensure a paper-based assessment is available for use in ELA and math. Ensure assessments are administered.

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?

Data collection. The administration of relevant assessments for progress monitoring data is needed. Tools for assessing students are needed.

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

Unable to assess based on lack of relevant data.

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

Assess, review, and planning in all subject areas.

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.

Training in the following areas are needed:

1. Data collection for progress monitoring
2. Progress monitoring
3. Student assessment
4. MTSS and RTI training

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Inconsistent assessment data is available for progress monitoring.

Measurable Outcome:

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

75% of students will be assessed with pre- and post-assessments during the 2021-22 school year.

Monitoring:

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

ELA teacher will monitor student entries and ensure pre-assessments are administered. Assessment results will be shared with instructional coach to ensure fidelity of progress monitoring plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Charles (kcharles1@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Paper-based assessments, to be developed or adopted.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students must be assessed in order to provide progress monitoring.

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.

Identify paper-based ELA assessment for progress monitoring.

Person Responsible

Joella Nortelus (nortelus@dadeschools.net)

Administer ELA assessments

Person Responsible

Kimberly Charles (kcharles1@dadeschools.net)

Develop progress monitoring plans

Person Responsible

Joella Nortelus (nortelus@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.

The overall index and that of Black/African American students was implicated in the last testing period. Improving ELA performance will necessarily impact Black/African American students who are deficient in ELA.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Inconsistent assessment data is available for progress monitoring.

Measurable Outcome:

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

75% of students will be assessed with pre- and post-assessments during the 2021-22 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Math teacher will monitor student entries and ensure pre-assessments are administered. Assessment results will be shared with instructional coach to ensure fidelity of progress monitoring plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carlos Won (carloswon@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Paper-based assessments, to be developed or adopted.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students must be assessed in order to provide progress monitoring.

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.

Identify paper-based math assessment for progress monitoring.

Person Responsible

Enrique Antonini (eantonini@dadeschools.net)

Administer math assessments

Person Responsible

Carlos Won (carloswon@dadeschools.net)

Develop progress monitoring plans

Person Responsible

Enrique Antonini (eantonini@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.

The overall index and that of Black/African American students was implicated in the last testing period. Improving math performance will necessarily impact Black/African American students who are deficient in math.

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Program infrastructure is a barrier to administering assessments with fidelity.

Measurable Outcome:

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

75% of students will be assessed in mathematics and ELA upon entry to the program during the 2021-22 school year.

ELA and math teacher will administer assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Assessment results will be shared with instructional coaches to ensure fidelity of assessment and development of progress monitoring plans.

Administrator will verify assessment progress

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alberto Iber (albertoiber@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

I-Ready assessments for middle school students

Edgenuity assessments for high school students

Investigate paper-based assessments

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students must be assessed in order to provide progress monitoring.

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.

Verify administration of assessments

Person Responsible

Alberto Iber (albertoiber@dadeschools.net)

Provide training, as needed, in assessment administration.

Person Responsible

Alberto Iber (albertoiber@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.

The overall index and that of Black/African American students was implicated in the last testing period. Improving accountability will necessarily improve the level of instruction to Black/African American students.

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.

Teachers and staff treat students with respect and kindness regardless of background. Services are provided on an individualized basis. The school personnel, communicates with parents and stakeholders, where the main objective is the successful transition back to society.

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

School administrators, teachers, coaches, and counselors.