Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Iprep Academy North



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| | |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| | |
| School Information | 7 |
| | |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 22 |
| | |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 31 |
| | |
| Budget to Support Goals | 31 |

Iprep Academy North

1420 NE 215TH ST, Miami, FL 33179

northregion.dadeschoools.net

Demographics

Principal: Francisco Garnica E

Start Date for this Principal: 2/9/2020

| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 6-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 46% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | ormation* |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For | or more information, click here. |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

- 1. have a school grade of D or F
- 2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
- 3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Information | 7 |
| | |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 22 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 31 |

Iprep Academy North

1420 NE 215TH ST, Miami, FL 33179

northregion.dadeschoools.net

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| High School 6-12 | No | 46% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 71% |
| School Grades History | | |
| Year Grade | | 2020-21 |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Challenge, nurture, and empower students' creativity with a global, rigorous, technology-enhanced college-preparatory curriculum.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Create a unique, collaborative environment that cultivates strong academic skills, knowledge, and talents of STEAM students and promotes life skills to increase their opportunities beyond graduation.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Garnica, Francisco | Principal | Oversees the daily activities and operations within the school. |
| Gbadebo, Samuel | Other | Provides support to students and teachers in implementing the Cambridge curriculum, manages school activities, manages the gradebook, and coordinates testing activities. |
| Allen, Natalia | Teacher, K-12 | Involves all stakeholders in school decision-making for student achievement through EESAC. |
| Wilson, Candice | Teacher, K-12 | Coordinates math department processes including student data review and curriculum implementation. |
| Collazo, Annette | Teacher, K-12 | Supports teaching and learning as Professional Development Liaison. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 2/9/2020, Francisco Garnica E

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.

5

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.

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

414

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

2

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

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 | 102 | 74 | 79 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 414 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 19 | 15 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Number of students enrolled | | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | | |
| One or more suspensions | | |
| Course failure in ELA | | |
| Course failure in Math | | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ESA Math assessment | | |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator Grade Level Total

Students with two or more indicators

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | lotal |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Retained Students: Current Year | | |
| Students retained two or more times | | |

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 56 | 69 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 241 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | |
| 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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | Total | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|----|----|----|-------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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 Grade Component | 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 Com | nparison | | | | , | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | nparison | 0% | | | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | Cohort Comparison 0% | | | | | | | | | |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | ELA | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Cor | Cohort Comparison | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison 0% | | | | • | | |

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

| | SCIENCE | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | | |
| 80 | 2021 | | | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | | | | |
| Cohort Con | | | | | | | | | |

| | | BIOLO | GY EOC | | |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| | | CIVIC | CS EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| · | | HISTO | RY EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| | ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-------------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State | | | | | |
| 2021 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | GEOME | TRY EOC | | | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State | | | | | |
| 2021 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady Diagnostic Tests (Reading and Mathematics), Midyear Assessments (ELA, Mathematics, Civics).

| | | Grade 6 | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 59.2 | 57.1 | 62.2 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 56 | 66.7 | 66.7 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 66.7 | 67.8 | 81.2 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 50 | 73.7 | 73.9 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | Grade 7 | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 62.8 | 60 | 71 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 64.7 | 50 | 72.7 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 60 | 55 | 63.2 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 53.3 | 50 | 57.1 |
| | Students With Disabilities | NA | NA | NA |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | NA | 87 | NA |
| Civics | Economically Disadvantaged | NA | 94 | NA |
| | Students With Disabilities | NA | NA | NA |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |

| | | Grade 8 | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 67.3 | 77.4 | 67.4 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 59.1 | 76.2 | 77.8 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 54.5 | 54.7 | 53.7 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 50 | 52.4 | 54.5 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0 | 27 | 0 |
| Science | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 26 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | Grade 9 | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 0 | 69 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 60 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Biology | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| US History | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | Grade 10 | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| | | Grade 11 | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|--------|
| | Ni wask = 11/0/ | Grade 11 | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| | | Grade 12 | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

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 | | |
| ELL | 57 | 48 | 50 | 34 | 12 | 11 | 54 | 69 | 35 | | | | |
| BLK | 65 | 62 | | 46 | 21 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 69 | 50 | 39 | 50 | 20 | 10 | 63 | 77 | 55 | | | | |
| WHT | 79 | 58 | 45 | 67 | 24 | 33 | 60 | 85 | 55 | | | | |
| FRL | 70 | 56 | 43 | 41 | 18 | 18 | 58 | 71 | 40 | | | | |

| | 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 |
| | | 2018 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 50 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 451 | | | | |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 | | | | |
| Percent Tested | 98% | | | | |
| 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 | 41 | | | | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO | | | | |
| 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 | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 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 | 49 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 48 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 56 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 46 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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.

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

The 2021 ELA FSA average proficiency across grade levels was 72% and the 2021 Mathematics FSA average proficiency across grade levels was 69%.

For the 2021 ELA FSA, when looking at the spread of proficiency attainment by grade level, there was a concentration of students attaining Level 4 proficiency in the 6th and 9th grades (24 students/31% and 12 students/36%, respectively); whereas in the 7th and 8th grades, the concentration was in Level 3 proficiency (19/36% and 18/27% students, respectively). This resulted in a total concentration of students attaining a level 4 (64 students), which was greater than any proficiency level.

Passing rates (levels 3-5) were as follows per grade level: 6th grade- 73%; 7th grade- 74%, 8th grade- 73%, and 9th grade- 64%. The 7th graders had the highest passing rate with 74%.

For the 2021 Mathematics assessments, including the Mathematics FSA, Algebra-1-EOC (6th grade), and GeometryEOC (8th and 9th grades), the highest performing students were the GeometryEOC students with 74% of students obtaining proficiency, then on the FSA were the 6th graders with 69% obtaining proficiency, and the lowest performing students were the Algebra-1-EOC students with 43% obtaining proficiency.

For the 2021 Science assessments, including the Science FSA and BiologyEOC (8th and 9th grades), the highest performers were those taking the BiologyEOC with 84% obtaining proficiency; and the 8th graders taking the Science FSA had the lowest passing rate of all subjects with 40% obtaining proficiency.

For the 2021 CivicsEOC (7th grade), the 77% of the students obtained proficiency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the 2020-2021 progress monitoring data in iReady, 8th grade student performance in ELA demonstrated the greatest need for improvement as their growth increased from 67.3% to 67.4% (only 0.1%) from the Fall to the Spring assessment.

Based on the 2020-2021 progress monitoring data in iReady, 8th grade student performance in Mathematics demonstrates the greatest need for improvement because scores declined from Fall to the Spring, 54.5% to 53.7%.

Based on the 2021 Spring assessments, including FSAs and EOCs, the following students demonstrate a need for greatest improvement: in ELA, the 9th graders (64% proficiency); in Mathematics, the Algebra 1 students (43% proficiency); in Science, the 8th graders (40% proficiency).

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

A contributing factor was teachers learning to implement dual curricula without standards-aligned resources. New actions to address this need include further and appropriate PD opportunities, appropriate standards-aligned resources, and more collaborative data analysis/data chats within and across departments.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the 2020 progress monitoring data in iReady, 6th grade Math showed the greatest improvement with scores increasing from 66.7% in the Fall to 81.2% in the Spring.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The contributing factors from Fall 2020 to Spring 2021 scores include effective instructional strategies, and before and after school tutoring. Our new actions took place when we added more school personnel mid-year and therefore expanded after school tutoring opportunities.

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

Learning will be accelerated through the use of data chats, family involvement, early reporting, and vertical planning.

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 focused on engaging all students, lesson planning, and utilizing learning data.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We will offer before and after school tutoring.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus

Based on the 2021 ELA FSA results of 72% proficiency and 2021 Mathematics FSA results of 69% proficiency, we believe greater data analysis will help improve our students' success.

Description and Rationale:

Data-Driven Decision-Making: All stakeholders should understand the data driven decisions driving instruction in the classroom. Collaborative discussion and analysis of data will improve teacher data driven decisions and will coordinate efforts within and across departments and grade levels.

Measurable Outcome: Increase student proficiency in Algebra I from 43% to 60%. Increase 8th grade Science proficiency from 40% to 50%. And 80 percent of students should show gains in ELA and Mathematics as reflected in the FSA assessments.

Monitoring:

BOY, MOY, and EOY assessments. Progress monitoring through iReady and tutoring interventions.

Person responsible

for Francisco Garnica (pr7459@dadeschools.net)

monitoring outcome:

Data-Driven Decision-Making: a process embedded in the culture of the school where data

based Strategy:

Evidence-

is used at every level to make informed decisions on what is best for students. This includes goal setting, interventions, teacher placement, course work, differentiating instruction etc.

Rationale for

Evidencebased Teachers provided input about strategies to improve instructional outcomes and expressed a need for Data-Driven Decision-Making.

Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

1. SLT will establish dates to review student assessment data within teams. (by September 30th)

Person Responsible

Annette Collazo (acollazo@dadeschools.net)

2. Teachers will engage in team meeting discussions and develop an action plan. (by September 30th)

Person Responsible

Annette Collazo (acollazo@dadeschools.net)

3. Principal will monitor and support implementation of action plans. (by October 11th)

Person Responsible

Francisco Garnica (pr7459@dadeschools.net)

4. Principal will evaluate process and determine next steps, including adjusting and/or continuing to support the process. (by October 11)

Person Responsible

Francisco Garnica (pr7459@dadeschools.net)

5. Teachers will again engage in team meeting discussions to reflect on implementation and collaborate on instructional strategies (by November 19th).

Person Responsible

Annette Collazo (acollazo@dadeschools.net)

6. Principal will again evaluate process and determine next steps, including adjusting and/or continuing to support the process. (by December 21st)

Person Responsible

Francisco Garnica (pr7459@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will collaborate and discuss data during faculty meetings to sustain data-driven decision-making. This will take place at each faculty meeting through April. This additional time will add to the data-driven collaboration process by creating further opportunities for collaboration.

Person Responsible

Francisco Garnica (pr7459@dadeschools.net)

During collaborative discussions at each faculty meeting through April, teachers will identify and discuss how differentiation is impacting students performing within the lowest-quartile.

Person Responsible

Annette Collazo (acollazo@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus
Description and

Based on the 2021 ELA FSA results of 72% proficiency and 2021 Mathematics FSA results of 69% proficiency, we believe continued and increased hands-on learning will help improve our students' success.

Description and help improve our students success

Rationale: Hands-On Learning was identified as way to increase student engagement and

therefore student acquisition and application of knowledge and skills.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase student proficiency in Algebra I from 43% to 60%. Increase 8th grade Science proficiency from 40% to 50%. And 80 percent of students should show gains in ELA

and Mathematics as reflected in the FSA assessments.

Monitoring:

BOY, MOY, and EOY assessments. Progress monitoring through iReady and tutoring

interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Francisco Garnica (pr7459@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Hands-On Learning is a learning style in which learning takes place by the students carrying out physical activities, rather than listening to a lecture or watching demonstrations. This may include using manipulatives to teach concepts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers provided input about strategies to improve instructional outcomes and expressed a need to increase student engagement with more Hands-On Learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create teacher group in Schoology for lesson collaboration to improve student engagement level. (by September 30)

Person Responsible

Candice Wilson (314063@dadeschools.net)

2. Teachers will share lessons that demonstrate hands-on elements. (by September 30th)

Person Responsible

Candice Wilson (314063@dadeschools.net)

3. Teachers will collaborate vertically and horizontally to ensure high levels of engagement for all students throughout the day. (by October 11th)

Person Responsible

Candice Wilson (314063@dadeschools.net)

4. Teachers will execute lessons and share feedback with colleagues, adjusting instruction to maintain/improve instructional engagement. (by October 11th)

Person Responsible

Candice Wilson (314063@dadeschools.net)

5. Teachers will reflect on the success and/or adjustments needed to improve collaboration process (by November 19th).

Person

Responsible

Candice Wilson (314063@dadeschools.net)

6. Teachers will set data-driven goals for collaboration (by December 21st).

Person

Responsible

Francisco Garnica (pr7459@dadeschools.net)

To continue to sustain the intended outcome, time will be allocated during faculty meeting for teachers to share hands-on learning ideas and successes, and identify opportunities to further collaborate on hands-on lessons during the school day through peer observations. This will take place at every faculty meeting through April. This additional time will add to the collaboration process by creating additional opportunities to collaborate.

Person

Responsible

Francisco Garnica (pr7459@dadeschools.net)

During faculty meeting through April, teachers will identify and discuss the response of the lower-quartile with respect to hands-on learning strategies.

Person

Responsible Candice Wilson (314063@dadeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus

Based on the 2021 ELA FSA results of 72% proficiency and 2021 Mathematics FSA results of 69% proficiency, we believe recognizing successes throughout the school year will help improve our students' end of year success.

Description and

Rationale:

Celebrate Successes: Students and student groups performing well should be recognized and celebrated to promote excellence and reward the hard efforts of students and teachers. This will help our new school continue to build a positive school culture centered around high expectations and supported by positive relationships among students, among staff, and between all stakeholders.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase student proficiency in Algebra I from 43% to 60%. Increase 8th grade Science proficiency from 40% to 50%. And 80 percent of students should show gains in ELA and

Mathematics as reflected in the FSA assessments.

Monitoring:

BOY, MOY, and EOY assessments. Progress monitoring through iReady and tutoring interventions.

Person responsible

Francisco Garnica (pr7459@dadeschools.net) for

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased

Celebrate Successes is when staff and student accomplishments are given special recognition and achievements are publicly celebrated allowing for encouragement from all

Strategy: stakeholders.

Rationale

for Evidencebased Strategy:

Teachers provided input about strategies to improve instructional outcomes and expressed

a need to increase student recognition and celebration of successes.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Activities Director will gather stakeholder input regarding awards and student recognition. (by September 30th)

Person Responsible

Samuel Gbadebo (sgbadebo@dadeschools.net)

2. Activities Director will set dates and methods/systems for school-wide recognition of student successes. (For example, for students: morning and afternoon announcement by teacher nomination, school newsletter, and end of quarter awards celebration. For example, staff: emails and recognition in staff meetings. (by September 30th)

Person Responsible

Samuel Gbadebo (sgbadebo@dadeschools.net)

3. Social Media Team promote successes on school media to engage all stakeholders. (at least once a month, starting in September)

Person Responsible

Samuel Gbadebo (sgbadebo@dadeschools.net)

Activities Director will assess impact of recognition and adjust as necessary. (by October 11th)

Person Responsible

Samuel Gbadebo (sgbadebo@dadeschools.net)

5. Activities Director will work with teachers and school staff to execute a school-wide and/or grade level student recognition event (by November 19th).

Person

Samuel Gbadebo (sgbadebo@dadeschools.net)

Responsible

6. Activities Director will work with teachers and school staff to plan and promote further recognition events (by December 21st).

Person

Responsible

Francisco Garnica (pr7459@dadeschools.net)

Continue the Values Matter campaign we are actively promoting each month to increase opportunities to regularly celebrate student successes.

Person

Samuel Gbadebo (sgbadebo@dadeschools.net)

Responsible

Starting in February through the remainder of the school year, we will celebrate teacher successes at faculty meetings with the Golden Apple Award. This additional action will result in further promoting a positive school culture centered around high expectations, which will ultimately impact student achievement.

Person

Responsible

Francisco Garnica (pr7459@dadeschools.net)

We will celebrate growth, not simply achievement, and we will adopt and model growth mindset thinking for staff and students, starting in February. This emphasis will support a positive school culture conducive to greater student achievement.

Person

Responsible

Samuel Gbadebo (sgbadebo@dadeschools.net)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems

Area of Focus Description and

Based on the 2021 ELA FSA results of 72% proficiency and 2021 Mathematics FSA results of 69% proficiency, we believe connecting learning with greater real-world applications will help improve our students' success.

Rationale:

Connecting with Families and Community was identified as a need to further engage students, families, and model community members to participate and/or support authentic, 21st century instruction in our classrooms across discipline to make learning more relevant to students' post-secondary interests. This need was mainly identified from the school climate survey results.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase student proficiency in Algebra I from 43% to 60%. Increase 8th grade Science proficiency from 40% to 50%. And 80 percent of students should show gains in ELA and Mathematics as reflected in the FSA assessments.

Monitoring:

BOY, MOY, and EOY assessments. Progress monitoring through iReady and tutoring interventions.

Person responsible

for Francisco Garnica (pr7459@dadeschools.net)

outcome:

Evidence-

Strategy:

based

monitoring

Connecting with Families and Community: Increasing parent and community involvement in schools refers to connecting with families and community stakeholders via opportunities for engagement and student support. This can be achieved by providing volunteering opportunities, facilitating trainings and workshops, finding ways to connect the core curriculum with the outside world, and expanding your school vision to include the community.

Rationale for Evidencebased

Strategy:

Teachers provided input about strategies to improve instructional outcomes and expressed a need to tap into our own community resources.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will propose calendar of fieldtrip/guest speaker opportunities with input from Activities Director. (by September 30th)

Person Responsible

Natalia Allen (natalia.allen@dadeschools.net)

PTSA board members and teachers will collaborate on guest speakers/presenters opportunities. (by October 11th)

Person Responsible

Natalia Allen (natalia.allen@dadeschools.net)

3. Activities Director in collaboration with teachers will help execute and monitor at least one interdisciplinary event. (by October 11th)

Person Responsible

Samuel Gbadebo (sgbadebo@dadeschools.net)

4. Activities Director and teachers will assess the impact of planned event/s on student engagement, and adjust future events as needed. (by October 11th)

Person Responsible

Samuel Gbadebo (sgbadebo@dadeschools.net)

5. Activities Director in collaboration with teachers will help plan at least one interdisciplinary field trip. (by November 19th)

Person

Responsible

Samuel Gbadebo (sgbadebo@dadeschools.net)

6. Activities Director in collaboration with teachers will help execute and monitor at least one interdisciplinary fieldtrip. (by December 21st)

Person

Responsible

Francisco Garnica (pr7459@dadeschools.net)

We seek to engage high school students in a college and/or career fair, either through the district or organized with our PTSA. This will help address deficiencies in our school climate survey that ultimately impact student success. We hope to execute this event in March.

Person

Responsible

Samuel Gbadebo (sgbadebo@dadeschools.net)

We have and will continue to survey our students, especially our lower quartile, with respect to their interests in the activities planned to ensure maximum engagement by this group.

Person

Responsible

Francisco Garnica (pr7459@dadeschools.net)

#5. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The school culture and environment will be monitored for compliance with school expectations such as uniform policy, attendance, digital citizenship, and appropriate school behavior throughout the school day.

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.

- -In the 2020-2021 school year, we implemented the Essential Practices to educate stakeholders on program requirements and expectations and strategies to promote mindfulness to develop a network of open communication along with a sense of security, ultimately, providing the foundations for academic success.
- -With moderate to exceptional success, we established some clubs, online forums, and informal mentor programs that helped develop a sense of cohesiveness amongst staff and students.
- -For the 2021-2022 school year, we will continue to build on these initiatives to further promote its positive impacts as captured by the Staff and Student School Climate Surveys, and address deficits identified by the Staff School Climate Survey in the category of "Teaching, Learning, and Assessment" and in the Student School Climate Survey in the category of "Quality of Education and Preparedness."

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

School stakeholders play a key role in promoting a positive culture and environment at our school. The following stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity: the principal, PLST team, EESAC, lead magnet teacher, guidance counselor, student government, PTSA, Miami Dade Community College, Lego Education, and Vigil. Our stakeholder groups will be responsible for the following: -setting positive and high expectations (the principal, PLST team, EESAC, lead magnet teacher, guidance counselor, student government, PTSA)

- -providing timely and specific feedback (principal, PLST team, EESAC, lead magnet teacher, guidance counselor, student government, PTSA)
- -sharing information (principal, PLST team, EESAC, lead magnet teacher, guidance counselor, student government, PTSA)
- -participating in training (principal, PLST team, lead magnet teacher, guidance counselor)
- -providing training (the principal, PLST team, EESAC, lead magnet teacher, guidance counselor, student government, PTSA, Miami Dade Community College, Lego Education, and Vigil)
- -sharing responsibility (the principal, PLST team, EESAC, lead magnet teacher, guidance counselor, student government, PTSA, Miami Dade Community College, Lego Education, and Vigil)

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | \$0.00 |
|---|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Select below: | \$0.00 |
| | | Total: | \$0.00 |