

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Academir Charter School West



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Academir Charter School West

14880 SW 26TH ST, Miami, FL 33185

www.academircharterschoolwest.com

Demographics

Principal: Retta Bello

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
2018-19 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 Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (73%) 2015-16: A (64%) 2014-15: A (73%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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.

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	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Academir Charter School West

14880 SW 26TH ST, Miami, FL 33185

www.academircharterschoolwest.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	61%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	98%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	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 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 AcadeMir Charter School West is to provide students with a well-rounded elementary school education, through a challenging program, focused on mathematics and science using innovative, reform-based instructional methods in a stimulating and nurturing environment that fosters maximum student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision for AcadeMir Charter School West is to provide students with a challenging and rigorous curriculum enabling students to be well prepared for life through adherence to the mission, shared purpose, and clearly articulated goals.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bernal, Olivia	Principal	<p>Olivia Bernal, Principal: The role of the Principal is to communicate a clear and common vision and mission, and ensures all teachers and staff are implementing the SIP and following the Problem-Solving Process. The principal assures instruction is aligned to state academic content standards, maintains continuous improvement in the building, designs instruction for student success, develops partnerships with parents and the community, and nurtures a positive school culture that promotes learning and engagement for students and adults and where each individual feels valued</p>
Ortega, Rosali	Assistant Principal	<p>Aimee Leyva, Assistant Principal: The role of the Assistant Principal is to assist in the development, establishment, and implementation of the goals and objectives of the school instructional program as set forth by the school principal. The Assistant Principal collaborates with the School Leadership Team to provide direction to staff in the implementing of goals and objectives and professional development. The Assistant Principal analyzes and disseminates information related to student data and progress, and evaluates the impact of instruction and interventions in Tiers 1-3; as well as, evaluates the progress of the school improvement program and of staff and assists to initiate needed improvement. Communicates student outcomes and celebrates and communicates successes.</p>
Muro, Barbara	Instructional Coach	<p>Barbara Muro is Curriculum Support Specialists for the area of Reading and Language Arts. The role of Curriculum Support Specialists provide classroom support and guidance to teachers on the implementation of the SIP. She engages in collaborative planning meetings with ELA teachers to ensure data is driving instructional decisions and monitors program effectiveness by reviewing data results from iReady, baseline, and Mid-Year Assessments, as well as student progress motioning through interventions. She also assist teachers in implementing of the instructional core program Wonders with fidelity. Mrs. Muro also provides support services through coaching cycles, professional development and instructional coaching to in an effort to build their instruction capacity and increase student achievement in Reading/Language Arts.</p>
Rodriguez, Tracy	Instructional Coach	<p>Ms. Lopez is Curriculum Support Specialists for the area of Mathematics. The role of Curriculum Support Specialists provide classroom support and guidance to teachers on the implementation of the SIP. She engages in collaborative planning meetings with Math teachers to ensure data is driving instructional decisions and monitors program effectiveness by reviewing data results from iReady, baseline, topic assessments and Mid-Year Assessments, as well as student progress motioning through interventions. She also assist teachers in implementing of the instructional core program GoMath with fidelity. Ms. Lopez also provides support services through coaching cycles, professional development and instructional coaching to in an effort to build their instruction capacity and increase student achievement in Math.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Valladares, Melissa	Instructional Coach	<p>Science Curriculum Support Specialist Science and ESOL Coordinator. The role of Curriculum Support Specialists provide classroom support and guidance to teachers on the implementation of the SIP. She engages in collaborative planning meetings with Math teachers to ensure data is driving instructional decisions and monitors program effectiveness by reviewing data results from iReady, baseline, topic assessments and Mid-Year Assessments, as well as student progress motioning through science enrichment. She also assist teachers in implementing of the instructional core program HMH Science Fusion with fidelity. Ms. Valladares also provides support services through coaching cycles, professional development and instructional coaching to in an effort to build their instruction capacity and increase student achievement in Science and STEM education. Additionally, Ms. Valladares monitors and supports the ESOL program at the school by supporting the monitoring the school-wide ESOL program by facilitating ESOL Testing, holding Annual LEP Committee meetings, providing teachers with ESOL strategies and resources, offer professional development for proper implementation of ESOL Strategies and techniques to support all ELL learners in the general education classroom.</p>
Chaudry, Hira	Teacher, K-12	<p>Kindergarten Teacher and Kindergarten Grade Level Chair. As a grade level chair Mrs. DeLaTorre serves as a liaison between the school leadership team and the grade level teachers. The grade level chair's duty is to meet with their team regularly, keep them informed, support and lead their team to achieve the school's student achievement goals, organize parent communication, coordinate grade-wide activities, and provide instructional support to teachers in Kindergarten grade level.</p>
Alvarez, Angelica	Teacher, K-12	<p>First Grade teacher and First Grade Level Chair. As a grade level chair Ms. Reyes serves as a liaison between the school leadership team and the grade level teachers. The grade level chair's duty is to meet with their team regularly, keep them informed, support and lead their team to achieve the school's student achievement goals, organize parent communication, coordinate grade-wide activities, and provide instructional support to teachers in the First Grade Level.</p>
Torano, Angelica	Teacher, K-12	<p>Second Grade teacher and Second Grade Level Chair. As a grade level chair Ms. Garcia serves as a liaison between the school leadership team and the grade level teachers. The grade level chair's duty is to meet with their team regularly, keep them informed, support and lead their team to achieve the school's student achievement goals, organize parent communication, coordinate grade-wide activities, and provide instructional support to teachers in the Second Grade Level.</p>
Ortega, Rosali	Teacher, K-12	<p>Third Grade teacher and Third Grade Level Chair. As a grade level chair Mrs. Ortega serves as a liaison between the school leadership team and the grade level teachers. The grade level chair's duty is to meet with their team regularly, keep them informed, support and lead their team to achieve the school's student achievement goals, organize parent communication,</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		coordinate grade-wide activities, and provide instructional support to teachers in the Third Grade Level.
Barbery, Nancy	Teacher, K-12	Fourth Grade teacher and Fourth Grade Level Chair. As a grade level chair Ms. Barbery serves as a liaison between the school leadership team and the grade level teachers. The grade level chair's duty is to meet with their team regularly, keep them informed, support and lead their team to achieve the school's student achievement goals, organize parent communication, coordinate grade-wide activities, and provide instructional support to teachers in the Fourth Grade Level.
Ortiz, Catalina	Teacher, K-12	Fifth Grade teacher and Fifth Grade Level Chair. As a grade level chair Ms. Ortiz serves as a liaison between the school leadership team and the grade level teachers. The grade level chair's duty is to meet with their team regularly, keep them informed, support and lead their team to achieve the school's student achievement goals, organize parent communication, coordinate grade-wide activities, and provide instructional support to teachers in the Fifth Grade Level.

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	110	91	121	107	101	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	618
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

39

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/16/2019

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	79%	63%	61%	79%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	61%	59%	65%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	57%	54%	61%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	89%	67%	62%	85%	62%	58%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains	73%	63%	59%	71%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%	56%	52%	67%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	86%	56%	56%	83%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	80%	78%	0%	75%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	110 (0)	91 (0)	121 (0)	107 (0)	101 (0)	88 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	618 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	1 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	1 (0)
One or more suspensions	2 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	5 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	77%	60%	17%	58%	19%
	2018	83%	61%	22%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	86%	64%	22%	58%	28%
	2018	78%	60%	18%	56%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	73%	60%	13%	56%	17%
	2018	75%	59%	16%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					

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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	90%	67%	23%	62%	28%
	2018	87%	67%	20%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	93%	69%	24%	64%	29%
	2018	87%	68%	19%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	83%	65%	18%	60%	23%
	2018	85%	66%	19%	61%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	86%	53%	33%	53%	33%
	2018	81%	56%	25%	55%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	45			73							
ELL	73	61	40	85	63	65	83				
HSP	79	70	48	89	74	70	87				
FRL	76	66	44	88	76	69	83				
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	50			40							
ELL	63	62	50	85	76						
HSP	79	62	43	86	70	68	81				
FRL	76	63	44	84	67	65	79				
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
ELL	69	54	50	89	75	67	46				
HSP	79	65	60	85	71	67	82				
FRL	75	60	55	84	68	63	79				

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	74
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	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	593
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	59
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	69
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 Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	75
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	72
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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 showed the lowest performance achievement was ELA Lowest 25%. The we had several new teachers to the school school and the curriculum. Recognizing that the prior year data showed a a lower percentage of proficiency in reading, an emphasis was placed on professional development for ELA core and ELA interventions.

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

the data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior school year was ELA Data for 3rd grade which showed a 6% decline from prior school year, from 84% to 77%. In third grade ELA we

had 3 new ELA teachers. Because the teachers were new they emphasized strategies and the process of getting the answer's, and student pacing and time management was not practiced. As a result many students did not get to finish the FSA in a timely manner.

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.

ELA Lowest 25% had the greatest gap when compared to the schools overall academic performance. The school is only 1% above the district average and 2% points above the state average with an overall 48% nearly a 30% point average deficit from the school proficiency of 79% in ELA. The trends in the last couple of years fluctuate in the 40th percentile. There has not been a solid plan for monitoring the ongoing performance of and interventions with the lowest 25% two years. Although we did increase from 41% to 48% of students making learning gains last year we still have much needed room to grow. This subgroup continues to be a under performing and a major school focus.

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

The data component component that showed the most improvement was was 4th grade Math proficiency with a 6% point increase and our Science Achievement Data. We went from 81% proficiency to 86% proficiency with a 5% increase from previous year. As a STEM school we put much emphasis on the integration of STEM across the curriculum. Students have daily STEM enrichment blocks, students attend weekly STEM Lab and teachers incorporate informational Science based text in ELA. We have noticed that our students are better prepared with foundation skills by the time they get to 5th grade. The science coach works closely with teachers offering PD and insures the spiraling of standards is happening through daily bell-ringers and instructional ppts. In math we lost a 4th grade math teacher and our math coach took over providing our fourth grade students with a strong math foundation.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Students who fell within the lowest 25 and who are also SWD. In addition, ten students scored a Level 1 on the standardized test but did not show course failures during the school year. Special consideration to the assessments given and alignment of them will be monitored in the upcoming year.

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

1. To increase ELA overall proficiency.
2. Increase ELA learning gains for students in the lowest 25%.
3. Increase Third Grade overall proficiency.
4. Increase Math proficiency in 5th grade.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	To increase overall ELA school-wide achievement
Rationale	According to the ELA student achievement from the previous school year, our greatest area for growth is in the area of ELA .
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan to achieve an overall 4% increase in ELA student achievement, from 79% to 83%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Barbara Muro (muro@academircharterschoolwest.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	The evidence-based strategies that will be evident in ELA instruction are: Integration of Article-a-Day by ReadWorks.org and integration of informational text through the use of paired text to support STEM education across the curriculum. Additionally, the use of rubrics to ensure fidelity in writing instruction will be implemented.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies have been selected due to our overall performance in the domain of Integration of Knowledge and Ideas on the FSA. Historically, our student population has demonstrated the greatest deficiency in this domain do to the complexity of the standards entailed and exposure to informational text at rigorous levels of text complexity. Due to the correlation between reading and writing for overall achievement in ELA, the use of rubrics to outline student expectations are being implemented.
Action Step	
Description	Professional development on the use of Article-a-Day and effective implementation into their daily instructional routine have taken place. During weekly common planning, teachers are provided with informational text resources to be used as paired-text with their ELA curriculum and discussions on how to use these resources to correlate to science topics in order to fully integrate STEM into their curriculum are taking place. In addition, teachers are being supported in the development of effective rubrics and how to best incorporate them into daily lessons. Planning for effective data-driven differentiated instruction also occur weekly with all ELA teachers. In addition, teachers will receive ongoing professional development in the areas indicated by our needs assessment and best practices for effective reading instruction.
Person Responsible	Olivia Bernal (obernal@dadeschools.net)

#2	
Title	To increase lowest 25% ELA learning gains
Rationale	The lowest 25% ELA learning gains from the previous school year shows great room for growth.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan to achieve a 5% increase in the lowest 25% ELA learning gains, from 48% to 53%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Barbara Muro (muro@academircharterschoolwest.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	In the general education classroom, the evidence-based strategies that will be evident in ELA instruction are: Integration of Article-a-Day by ReadWorks.org and integration of informational text through the use of paired text to support STEM education across the curriculum. Additionally, specific targeted interventions are implemented using the individual student data to meet the needs of these learners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies have been selected due to student performance on the Spring 2019 FSA ELA and I-Ready AP1 Reading. The resources being used to provide specific interventions are: Wonders, WonderWorks, I-Ready Toolbox, and ReadWorks.org.
Action Step	
Description	Professional Development on the latest research-based strategies have been provided to teachers. Additionally, interventions are provided to this population of student weekly, and school-wide ELA tutoring is offered twice a week throughout the months of October-March. Lastly, through weekly common planning, teachers are provided support in planning and developing resources to target the specific needs of these students through the DI portion of instruction.
Person Responsible	Olivia Bernal (obernal@dadeschools.net)

#3	
Title	To increase overall proficiency in third grade ELA.
Rationale	Overall proficiency in third grade ELA from the previous school year shows great room for growth.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan to achieve a 7% increase in our Third grade overall proficiency in ELA, from 77% to 84%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Barbara Muro (muro@academircharterschoolwest.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	The evidence-based strategies that will be evident in ELA instruction are: Integration of Article-a-Day by ReadWorks.org and integration of informational text through the use of paired text to support STEM education across the curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies have been selected due to our overall performance in the domain of Integration of Knowledge and Ideas on the FSA. Historically, our student population have demonstrated the greatest deficiency in this domain do to the complexity of the standards entailed and exposure to informational text at rigorous levels of text complexity.
Action Step	
Description	Professional development on the use of Article-a-Day and effective implementation into their daily instructional routine have taken place. During weekly common planning, teachers are provided with effective implementation of the instructional framework utilizing timers for lesson pacing, informational text resources to be used as paired-text with their ELA curriculum and discussions on how to use these resources to correlate to science topics in order to fully integrate STEM into their curriculum. Planning for effective data-driven differentiated instruction also occurs weekly with all ELA teachers. In addition, school-wide ELA tutoring is offered to the lowest 25% of students in third grade, twice a week from October-March.
Person Responsible	Olivia Bernal (obernal@dadeschools.net)

#4	
Title	To increase overall proficiency in Fifth grade Mathematics.
Rationale	The overall achievement on the Spring 2019 FSA Mathematics decreased by 2%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan to achieve a 3% increase in our fifth grade overall proficiency in mathematics, from 83% to 86%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Melissa Valladares (valladares@academircharterschoolwest.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	The evidence-based strategies that will be evident in Mathematics instruction are: the use of Topic test to assess and monitor student mastery of standards. Teachers will use the data provided in Topic assessments to drive their instruction and spiral into bellringers and DI. Additionally students are supported through intervention weekly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies have been selected due to our overall performance on the Spring 2019 FSA Mathematics. Planning for effective data-driven differentiated instruction also occur weekly with all Math teachers. In addition, school-wide Math tutoring is offered to the students in fifth grade, twice a week from October-April. Lastly, using iReady toolbox and Go Math reteach specific standard driven instruction is provided to the students to meet their individual educational needs.
Action Step	
Description	Professional development on the use of Go Math curriculum. During weekly common planning, teachers are provided with resources to be used alongside the Go Math curriculum and discussions on how to use these resources to correlate to desegregated data from the topic assessments. Planning for effective data-driven differentiated instruction also occur weekly with all Math teachers. In addition, school-wide Math tutoring is offered to the lowest 25% of students, twice a week from October-April. In addition, teachers will receive ongoing professional development in the areas indicated by our needs assessment and best practices for effective math instruction.
Person Responsible	Olivia Bernal (obernal@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

1.To increase STEM integration across the curriculum and increase Science Achievement by 3 percentage points.

Professional developments and instructional support from curriculum coaches will be provided to increase teacher confidence and knowledge of STEM curriculum integration. Professional developments provided in-house will target the school-wide STEM integration initiative. Professional development in Claims Evidence Reasoning, the Engineering Design Process, and 4 C's: Critical Thinking, Collaboration, Communication, and Creativity will be given throughout the school year to deepen understanding of these initiatives, facilitate instruction, and increase student achievement by

increasing the opportunities students will have with hands-on, project based learning focused on solving real-world problems in a student centered collaborative environment.

- The Math, Science, and ELA Instructional Coaches facilitate the intellectual and professional growth of the teachers.

- STEM PLC and STEM Book Study

- STEM Lab: PLTW Curriculum

- Robotics Program

- STEM Enrichment Block: 30 minutes daily of STEM enrichment learning opportunity

STEM integration will be monitored for effectiveness of this strategy, administration will conduct walk-throughs to observe the application of STEM strategies in the classroom.

2. To increase in school safety and security by incorporating proactive safety measures, systems and resources to enhance and maintain a safe school building.

- Ensuring that all visitors are identified and that they only enter the school building through the single point entry identified as the Main Office entrance.

- All staff members will be required to wear their staff identification badges at all times when in the building.

- Visitors will sign in using the Concierge Identification system which will generate a ID to be worn while on

campus. This system will also provide data reports showing the number of visitors entering and exiting the building.

building.

- All staff members will be trained and reminded of policies and procedures to ensure a safe school (CRAZE

Training).

- All staff members will be trained on

- Safe School Officer on campus from bell to bell

- The Threat Assessment Team will complete the Florida Safe School Assessment Tool

- The Threat Assessment Team will hold monthly meetings.

- The school will conduct monthly evacuation drills and the Threat assessment team will be assigned posts and areas to assist with drills.

- FortifyFL will be an app used and will be placed on all school computers, school website and posted around

campus. Parents, students, staff and community stakeholders will be made aware of this anonymous system that can be used notify proper authority of suspicious activity or threats.

The Threat Assessment Team members will conduct monthly compliance checks to ensure the safety and security of school campus and that the school is in compliance with Florida Senate Bill 7026 The Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Public Safety Act.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: To increase overall ELA school-wide achievement				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: To increase lowest 25% ELA learning gains				\$5,280.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	0410 - Academir Charter School West	School Improvement Funds	120.0	\$5,280.00

			<i>Notes: School SAC funds will be used to pay for after school tutors tutoring students in the lowest 25% free of cost.</i>
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: To increase overall proficiency in third grade ELA.	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: To increase overall proficiency in Fifth grade Mathematics.	\$0.00
Total:			\$5,280.00