

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Academy For International Education Charter School



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>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>17</b> |

# Academy For International Education Charter School

1080 LABARON DR, Miami Springs, FL 33166

<http://www.aiecharter.net>

## Demographics

Principal: Yaquelin Ricardo

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2019

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Closed: 2022-06-30   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 0%   |
| <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: A (65%)<br>2017-18: B (56%)<br>2016-17: B (57%)<br>2015-16: B (59%) |
| <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>   | N/A  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## School Board Approval

N/A

## 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>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>17</b> |

# Academy For International Education Charter School

1080 LABARON DR, Miami Springs, FL 33166

<http://www.aiecharter.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) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>KG-5                        | Yes                    | 94%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | Yes                    | 96%  |

## School Grades History

| Year  | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A       | A       | B       | B       |

## School Board Approval

N/A

## 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 Academy for International Education is to create student-leaders who are empowered by challenging academic experiences while solving real-world problems in a culture of innovation and collaboration. Our students think critically, discover relentlessly, and act ethically, in service of humanity.

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

AIE will immerse its students in science, technology, engineering, arts and mathematics (STEAM) as a way of seeking facts and making sense of the world around them. At AIE learning is focused on active exploration of major concepts, ideas and theories through hands-on learning and real-life problem solving. Students will be challenged to use scientific knowledge and critical thinking skills as they take ownership of their personal academic exploration and growth.

### 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   |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| Hirsh, Vera       | Other               | Mrs. Vera Hirsh, Head of Schools works with team members to identify student and staff needs. Collaborates with team members in problem-solving and planning. Ensures that all leadership members attend the Leadership Weekly Meetings in order to discuss school's concerns, budget, expenses, technology, security, software usage, staff deployment, purchase orders, etc. Vera Hirsh makes sure that the implementation of the RAPTOR and school security is in place and its implemented with fidelity. Allocates resources to meet the needs of all teachers, students, and staff. Understands and ensures the integration and implementation of goals, action plans, data, and practices. Ensures communication of information. Plans the involvement of families and community regarding school-wide goals and activities. |
| Ricardo, Yaquelin | Principal           | Mrs. Ricardo ensures that teachers work in collaboration and set high expectations for all students to close the achievement gap between advantaged and less advantaged students. Implements and schedules MTSS/ RTI. Monitors school attendance. Makes decisions for the use of data driven instruction. Meets with parents, teachers, and staff regarding academics, data, and activities for the continuous improvement. Plans Professional Development and supports classroom instruction by modeling lessons. Shares a common goal of improving instruction for all students. Collects, analyzes, and shares data.   |
| Bertrand, Megan   | Assistant Principal | Ms. Megan Bertrand provides instructional support and guidance to staff in the areas of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM). Ms. Bertrand works with the leadership team to insure STEM curriculum integration is taking place in all content areas. She is also responsible for making sure that AIE's practices align with MDCPS STEM designation requirements to ensure the school receives a STEM designation from the district. provide support to teachers, parents, and students regarding student behavior and discipline. Works with team members to provide support and meets the needs of students, parents, and staff.  |
| Camji, Carlos     | Teacher, ESE        | Carlos Camji, Exceptional Student Education (ESE) teacher, collaborates with general education teachers to plan activities and accommodate students' IEP. Mr. Camji assists with MTSS/RTI TIER 3 implementation and data collection. In addition, he works in collaboration with teachers to monitor students' progress. Mr. Camji meets with other professionals such as Psychologists, Speech Pathologists, Social Workers, and other agencies in order to revise, update, and evaluate student's IEP's.  |
| Canelo, Dorremi   | School Counselor    | Dorremi Canelo and Margarita Avalos plan and implement an anti-bullying program. They meet with students for individual and group counseling. Ms. canelo implements a school wide character education program. She also implements the Do the Right Thing Program (DTRT). In addition, both counselors provide support to teachers and administrators to make sure students and parents are aware of the importance of attendance. Both recognize students, parents, and teachers who cooperate and participate in school's activities.   |

| Name            | Title         | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-----------------|---------------|--|
| Gonzalez, Kelly | Teacher, K-12 | <p>Grade Level Chairs and Instructional Support:<br/> Ivette Casal<br/> Jennifer Matus<br/> Kelly Gonzalez<br/> Catherine Curbelo<br/> Amanda Dean</p> <p>Grade Level Chairs and Instructional Support Personnel share a common goal of improving teaching and learning. Communicate and collaborate with administrators and staff to inform, share, and assist with the problem solving process. Participate and assist with data analysis, best practices, and resources implementation.</p> |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 8/1/2019, Yaquelin Ricardo

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

#### Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

#### Demographic Data

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Closed: 2022-06-30        |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)                           | Elementary School<br>KG-5 |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)                                    | K-12 General Education    |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>   | No                        |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 0%                        |



|  |  |
|--|--|
| <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: A (65%)<br>2017-18: B (56%)<br>2016-17: B (57%)<br>2015-16: B (59%) |
| <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>   | N/A  |
| * 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               | 57          | 53 | 62 | 71 | 61 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 378   |
| 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                     | 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     | 1           | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 9/11/2020

**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     | 52          | 58 | 69 | 59 | 60 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 363   |
| 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     | 2           | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

**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     | 52          | 58 | 69 | 59 | 60 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 363   |
| 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     | 2           | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

**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             | 60%    | 62%      | 57%   | 62%    | 57%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 61%    | 62%      | 58%   | 61%    | 61%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 59%    | 58%      | 53%   | 56%    | 58%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 66%    | 69%      | 63%   | 62%    | 66%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 59%    | 66%      | 62%   | 47%    | 65%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 63%    | 55%      | 51%   | 35%    | 57%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 48%    | 55%      | 53%   | 47%    | 52%      | 51%   |

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) |     |     |     |     |     | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|           | K                                 | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   |       |
|           | (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 | 56%    | 60%      | -4%                        | 58%   | -2%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 58%    | 61%      | -3%                        | 57%   | 1%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 63%    | 64%      | -1%                        | 58%   | 5%                      |

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                       | 2018 | 54%    | 60%      | -6%                        | 56%   | -2%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 9%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 73%    | 60%      | 13%                        | 56%   | 17%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 42%    | 59%      | -17%                       | 55%   | -13%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 31%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 19%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 72%    | 67%      | 5%                         | 62%   | 10%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 84%    | 67%      | 17%                        | 62%   | 22%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -12%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 76%    | 69%      | 7%                         | 64%   | 12%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 60%    | 68%      | -8%                        | 62%   | -2%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 16%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -8%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 67%    | 65%      | 2%                         | 60%   | 7%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 61%    | 66%      | -5%                        | 61%   | 0%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 46%    | 53%      | -7%                        | 53%   | -7%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 44%    | 56%      | -12%                       | 55%   | -11%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### 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                                       | 28       | 59     | 82          | 44        | 59      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 47       | 62     | 61          | 60        | 61      | 65           | 32       | 65      | 100       |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 60       | 62     | 58          | 67        | 60      | 65           | 49       | 77      | 91        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 61       | 60     |             | 71        | 52      |              |          | 75      |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 56       | 62     | 61          | 63        | 60      | 67           | 43       | 74      | 90        |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| SWD                                       | 32       | 41     |             | 33        | 47      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 35       | 43     | 36          | 49        | 53      | 64           | 29       | 36      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 57       | 48     | 40          | 63        | 56      | 58           | 56       | 58      | 73        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 52       | 29     |             | 57        | 57      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 52       | 44     | 37          | 58        | 54      | 57           | 53       | 50      | 66        |                   |                     |
| 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 |
| SWD                                       | 54       | 54     | 50          | 61        | 43      |              | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 36       | 54     | 56          | 48        | 34      | 26           | 21       | 35      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 63       | 61     | 56          | 63        | 47      | 37           | 48       | 75      | 67        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 62       | 76     |             | 62        | 48      |              | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 58       | 58     | 52          | 60        | 46      | 33           | 41       | 70      | 65        |                   |                     |

### 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)  | N/A  |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 65   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 67   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 651  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 54   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 62   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |
| 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                                    |     |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 66  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO  |
| 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   | 64  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 64  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

The data component that shows the lowest performance is Science.

Some contributing factors to THE 2019 test administration's low performance are the following:

1. Limited of Benchmarks instruction in lower grade levels that are needed for students to learn skills by the time they get to grade 5.
2. Using data to drive instruction.

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

Science is the data component that showed a decline by 8% since all other areas improved. Some factors that contributed to this decline are:

1. Limited of benchmark instruction in lower grades.
2. Students lack of note taking and study skills habit.
3. Data driven -instruction.
4. Students not able to apply the new knowledge learned.

**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.**

Science is the data component that shows a gap between the state and AIE. There is a 4% gap between AIE and the State.

As mentioned above, benchmarks taught in previous grade levels are needed for students to learn skills and apply the new concepts learned. Using data to drive instruction may have also been a factor that contributed to this trend. Additionally, students lack of study habits and note taking skills may have contributed to this gap. Lastly, students have difficulties applying the new knowledge learned.

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

ELA Learning Gains is the component that showed the most improvement.

Some actions the school took in this area are the following:

1. Providing after school tutoring.
2. Implementing RTI with fidelity.
3. Improving classroom instruction.
4. Use of I-Ready and monitoring student's progress.

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

Two potential areas of concerns are:

1. Science instruction and student's progress.
2. Continue implementing rigorous instruction across grade levels.

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

1. Science instruction and student's academic performance's improvement.
2. Vocabulary knowledge across the grade levels.
3. Implementation of rigorous instruction.
4. Allowing students to become critical thinkers.
5. Monitoring student progress using various data.
6. Increasing literacy across grade levels.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Instructional practice impacts student learning in many ways. Teacher's implementation of high-quality instruction and application of best practices during daily instruction allow students to perform better, improve academic achievement, and be exposed to innovative ways of learning.

**Measurable Outcome:** Data results such as I-Ready, class assessments, topic assessments, and baseline data will allow us to determine and evaluate this area of focus.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Yaquelin Ricardo (yricardo1@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The implementation of instructional practice and collaborative planning will allow teachers and administrators to analyze data, make instructional decisions, plan, and reflect on teaching and learning.

Rigorous instruction will force students to confront misconceptions, reconsider positions, separate the implicit from the explicit, and engage in critical thinking practices.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will use common planning to share ideas, resources, collaborate, and use data to drive instruction. During professional developments, curriculum meetings, and teacher's feedback and reflections, teachers and administrators agree that collaborative planning is an effective strategy to increase academic achievement and teacher development.

#### Action Steps to Implement

Conduct curriculum meetings to review pacing guides, data, student's achievement, and effective strategies to use during instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Yaquelin Ricardo (yricardo1@dadeschools.net)

Offer professionals development on campus to specifically address teacher's needs based on student's data and the school's goals and focus.

**Person Responsible:** Yaquelin Ricardo (yricardo1@dadeschools.net)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities



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

**Implementing rigorous instruction using the Depth of Knowledge levels of questioning and utilizing data driven instruction in all content areas.**

## 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.

School culture is a key element of school success. AIE Charter Lower School works with teachers, staff, students, and parents to build and foster positive relationships in many ways. For the 2020-2021 school year, we will focus on empowering teachers and staff. We will continue implementing shout-outs for sharing positive recognition and/or accomplishments. During faculty meetings, we will continue to recognize teachers with the "Pioneers Monthly Awards". This award is given to a teacher who had excel, showed leadership, and contributed to the school culture and overall school performance. Additionally, the Lower School will continue to implement the growth mindset. Students in the past years have been taught the growth mindset through various lessons to build student confidence, increase motivation, and student achievement. Stakeholders will collaborate and give suggestions for continuous improvement. They can recommend best practices and share responsibilities in improving best practices. We will continue to communicate and involve all stakeholders during EESAC meetings, SIP discussions, and parent's meetings.

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

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

## Part V: Budget

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

|        |        |  |        |
|--------|--------|--|--------|
| 1      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning | \$0.00 |
| Total: |        |  | \$0.00 |