Downtown Miami Charter School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Downtown Miami Charter School

305 NW 3RD AVE, Miami, FL 33128

http://www.downtowncharter.org

Demographics

Principal: Nicolas Bardoni

Start Date for this Principal: 8/28/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (57%) 2014-15: B (56%)
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	TS&I

* 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

Downtown Miami Charter School

305 NW 3RD AVE, Miami, FL 33128

http://www.downtowncharter.org

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)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	91%

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	C	B	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 DMCS family "believes in the magic of education" and fosters our passion for learning by inspiring leaders through the arts , science and civics.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Accomplishing this mission is supported with: 1) Students, teachers, staff, families, and community members will work cooperatively in a positive atmosphere; 2) DMCS will be the community model for providing exceptional, interdisciplinary educational experiences and establishing diverse partnerships within our community.

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
Padierne Delgado, Amanda	Principal	
McDonald, Aldin	Dean	
Ruiz, Berna	Instructional Coach	
Mehler , Leah	Instructional Coach	
	Assistant Principal	Roselyn Anglade

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	
	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	7	5	5	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/28/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	8	4	5	10	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	12	18	18	20	6	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	49	37	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	127

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	3	9	11	7	31	17	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

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	1	8	4	5	10	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	12	18	18	20	6	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	49	37	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	127

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	3	9	11	7	31	17	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

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	58%	62%	57%	56%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	62%	58%	57%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	58%	53%	52%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	69%	63%	64%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains	52%	66%	62%	69%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	55%	51%	58%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	46%	55%	53%	41%	52%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (1)	0 (8)	0 (4)	0 (5)	0 (10)	0 (5)	0 (33)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (4)	0 (12)	0 (18)	0 (18)	0 (20)	0 (6)	0 (78)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (49)	0 (37)	0 (86)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	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.

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	59%	60%	-1%	58%	1%	
	2018	61%	61%	0%	57%	4%	
Same Grade Comparison	-2%						
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	62%	64%	-2%	58%	4%	
	2018	59%	60%	-1%	56%	3%	
Same Grade Comparison	3%						
Cohort Comparison	1%						
05	2019	46%	60%	-14%	56%	-10%	
	2018	52%	59%	-7%	55%	-3%	
Same Grade Comparison	-6%						
Cohort Comparison	-13%						

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	66%	67%	-1%	62%	4%
	2018	66%	67%	-1%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	69%	-9%	64%	-4%
	2018	76%	68%	8%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	43%	65%	-22%	60%	-17%
	2018	55%	66%	-11%	61%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	53%	-10%	53%	-10%
	2018	43%	56%	-13%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	27	38	25	23	33	43					
ELL	62	62	48	63	49	47	59				
BLK	51	47	54	57	46	28	33				
HSP	66	60	52	68	58	67	72				
FRL	57	54	56	61	52	40	45				
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	17	35	38	25	40	33					
ELL	45	60	73	57	72	57					
BLK	56	55	55	70	76	66	41				
HSP	62	61	67	71	74	55	38				
FRL	57	58	62	70	74	61	43				

	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	11	45	64	26	50	46					
ELL	48	59	64	67	76	69					
BLK	52	54	47	60	66	51	40				
HSP	62	62	61	71	73	68	42				
FRL	55	57	50	63	68	56	40				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
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	45
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	62
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	53
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 component that showed the lowest performance was 5th grade mathematics with a decrease of 12%. The contributing factors were teacher turnover and lack of experience in content area.

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

The component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was 4th grade mathematics with a decline 16%. The contributing factors were lack of content knowledge.

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.

The component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 5th grade math. With 22% difference. The contributing factors were teacher turnover and lack of experience in content area.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 4th grade ELA with a 3% increase. The contributing factor was distribution of students, teacher to student ratio and small group instruction.

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

The first area of concern is overall school wide mathematics achievement. From 2018-2019, we dropped 9 percentage points going from 71 % to 62%. Putting us below both state and district achievement norms. The second area of concern is school wide mathematics learning gains. Overall mathematics learning gains dropped 23 percentage points going from 75% to 52%. Additionally, learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile dropped 22 percentage points going from 63% to 41%.

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

1. Mathematics Achievement
2. Mathematics learning gains
3. Science Achievement
4. ELA learning gains
5. ELA lowest 25 %

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Mathematics Achievement
Rationale	The first area of concern is overall school wide mathematics achievement. From 2018-2019, we dropped 9 percentage points going from 71 % to 62%. Putting us below both state and district achievement norms.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our measurable outcome for mathematics achievement will be to reach 68% overall proficiency of 2019-2020 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amanda Padierne Delgado (adelgado@downtowncharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher Instructional Strategies outlined by Robert Marzano.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According Robert Marzano's book "What Works in Schools" factors that influence student performance include teacher instructional strategies.
Action Step	
Description	1. Tiered Small Group Instruction 2. Cooperative Learning 3. On- Going Progress Monitoring 4. Setting Objectives 5. Providing Feedback
Person Responsible	Berna Ruiz (bruiz@downtowncharter.org)

#2	
Title	ELA Achievement
Rationale	Although, there was not a noticeable difference in achievement of this content area, given the population of students we serve, focusing on this area will support our overall performance as a schools.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our measurable outcome for mathematics achievement will be to reach 61% overall proficiency of 2019-2020 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amanda Padierne Delgado (adelgado@downtowncharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher Instructional Strategies outlined by Robert Marzano.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According Robert Marzano's book "What Works in Schools" factors that influence student performance include teacher instructional strategies.
Action Step	
Description	1. Tiered Small Group Instruction 2. Cooperative Learning 3. On- Going Progress Monitoring 4. Setting Objectives 5. Providing Feedback
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Learning Gains Mathematics and ELA
Rationale	The most noticeable change in our school data, was learning gains, in some areas we saw a difference of over 20% points. Given this data our major goal for the school will be to provide targeted instruction.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our measurable outcome will be for 100% of students in an FSA tested grade level to making learning gains points in both ELA and Mathematics.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Berna Ruiz (bruiz@downtowncharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using data to drive instruction by providing each student with targeted instruction delivery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According Robert Marzano's book "What Works in Schools" factors that influence student performance include being able identify student learning deficiencies and providing instruction that facilities the progress of the student.
Action Step	
Description	1. Weekly Data Chats 2. Tiered Small Group Instruction 3. On-Going Progress Monitoring 4. Tier 3 Intervention Services 5. Success Block
Person Responsible	Amanda Padierne Delgado (adelgado@downtowncharter.org)

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).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Invite Parents for FSA night, volunteer night, open house, dad day, meet and greet the teachers, and to celebrate different events such as Hispanic Heritage Month, Black History Month, leadership academy showcases, ,cooperative learning and community services.

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Downtown Miami Charter school will work with the support facilitation teachers to provide classroom support, assemblies, small group counseling, individual counseling and referrals to community services. The Student Services Coordinator will utilize data-based decision making to close academic, social-emotional and college-career equity gaps by connecting students with the services they need. Check-in/ check-out program will be utilized with students in need of positive adult interactions and positive feedback throughout the day. Our Mental Health Counselor will also work closely with our tier 3 students and their families. All staff has been trained in the calm class curriculum that is utilized throughout the day. Lastly, we will are working closely with our Dynamite Dolphin population. Each teacher has adopted one dynamite dolphin and they work closely with them and their teachers.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Local preschools visit DMCS towards the end of the school year, giving the teachers an opportunity to see the instructional strategies being utilized in the kindergarten classrooms so they can prepare their students for kindergarten. During the summer, DMCS holds mandatory kindergarten workshops for students and their parents to learn what is necessary for a child to be successful in kindergarten. The students are also pre-screened so parents can work on the child's weak areas throughout summer. We also provide transitional counseling for new students and middle school parent night aiding in transitioning to middle school.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Leadership team meets with teachers to discuss and review student data and overall implementation of the RtI Plan. RTI data binders are reviewed along with weekly observations of teachers and students and their data for students who performed below and are predicted to score below proficiency. This team also reviews our RtI model and ensures that students are being pulled for small group instruction (Tier 3) and are attending our extended day program. Lastly, this team discusses all students who are not making progress with the RtI interventions. The leadership team and teachers identify specific problems, analyze why they occur, , brainstorm a plan and evaluate the effectiveness of our plan.
The team participates in professional development to ensure that DMCS is using the most effective strategies to help students catch up to their grade level.
Every student receives Tier I and Tier II instruction. Students begin the day with remediation or enrichment of standards through project based learning through their academies.They are regrouped after data analysis of unit assessment .Students are then invited to attend extended day, CCLC, Saturday tutoring will also be offered in the second part of the year if they are reading one year or more grade level below or considered as the lowest 25% of achievement on state testing.

Tier I – K-5 Wonders and programs such as iReady (Reading/Math), Imagine Math and Reading Plus and Imagine Literacy for ELL , student two or more levels below grade level.
Tier I -6th Grade Collection, Novel Studies, and online programs such as iReady (Reading/Math), and Reading Plus, CSUSA Benchmark, aligned to FSA for all grades.
Tier II – Small groups, iReady (Reading/Math) , Leveled Readers, Weekly IFA assessments
Tier III – Small groups for Fountas and Pinnell

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

All DMCS students participate in Career Week each year. Students in K-6 have have professionals come in and speak to them. Sixth grade students create resumes and partake in group interviews with local business owners and professionals.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Mathematics Achievement				$54,978.80
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		690-Computer Software	3600 - Downtown Miami Charter School	School Improvement Funds		$50,355.50
			Notes: I-Ready and Teacher Tool-Box 30,355.50 Imagine Math Bundle 20,000			
		520-Textbooks	3600 - Downtown Miami Charter School	General Fund		$4,623.30
			Notes: Performance Coach Math 4623.30			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Achievement				$50,355.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		690-Computer Software	3600 - Downtown Miami Charter School	School Improvement Funds		$50,355.50
			Notes: 1. Tiered Small Group Instruction 2. Cooperative Learning 3. On- Going Progress Monitoring 4. Setting Objectives 5. Providing Feedback			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Learning Gains Mathematics and ELA				$0.00
					Total:	$105,334.30