

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Miami Community Charter Middle School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>            | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>21</b> |

# Miami Community Charter Middle School

18720 SW 352ND ST, Florida City, FL 33034

www.mccedu.org

## Demographics

**Principal: Stephany Papili**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2019

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 92%   |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (54%)<br>2017-18: C (43%)<br>2016-17: C (44%)<br>2015-16: D (38%)<br>2014-15: D (39%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | 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](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>21</b> |

# Miami Community Charter Middle School

18720 SW 352ND ST, Florida City, FL 33034

www.mccedu.org

## School Demographics

|   |                               |   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | <b>2018-19 Title I School</b> | <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
| Middle School<br>6-8                                    | Yes                           | 95%   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)          | <b>Charter School</b>         | <b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                                  | Yes                           | 99%   |

## School Grades History

| Year  | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B       | C       | C       | D       |

## 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.**

At MCCS (Miami Community Charter School), our faculty is committed to empowering our students through mentorship to be held accountable by teaching them to embrace responsibility, demonstrate mutual respect, and engage in open communication. Our continuous collaboration of all stakeholders will provide a safe and nurturing environment which promotes students' social-emotional and academic growth. Students will feel secure in embracing new challenges by identifying their individual strengths, motivating them through goals, and celebrating their victories. Through our endeavors and dedication to community service, our students will achieve their full potential and become productive members of society.

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

As life long learners, MCCS students will take ownership to transform obstacles into opportunities for a better 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 |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Papili, Stephany    | Principal                |                                 |
| Rieumont, Mildrelis | Assistant Principal      |                                 |
| Mejia, Raquel       | Teacher, ESE             |                                 |
| Mitchell, Michelle  | Teacher, K-12            |                                 |
| Rezaie, Jila        | Other                    |                                 |
| Rezaie, Jila        | Assistant Principal      |                                 |
| Qureshi, Wajida     | Teacher, K-12            |                                 |
| Saavedra, Ruben     | Instructional Technology |                                 |

### 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 | 98 | 112 | 97 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 307 |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0   | 4  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 5   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6  | 3   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 9   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 6   | 4  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 20  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 32  | 32 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 93  |

**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 | 37 | 58 | 44 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 139   |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

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

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

Friday 9/13/2019

**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     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 6  | 9  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |
| 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           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4  | 1  | 4  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 43 | 60 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 160   |

**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 | 45 | 43 | 56 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 144   |

**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 | 12 | 6  | 9  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |
| 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           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4  | 1  | 4  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 43 | 60 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 160   |

**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 | 45 | 43 | 56 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 144 |

**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             | 42%    | 58%      | 54%   | 34%    | 53%      | 52%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 55%    | 58%      | 54%   | 43%    | 55%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 52%    | 52%      | 47%   | 35%    | 48%      | 44%   |
| Math Achievement            | 42%    | 58%      | 58%   | 39%    | 54%      | 56%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 61%    | 56%      | 57%   | 48%    | 56%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 64%    | 54%      | 51%   | 44%    | 51%      | 50%   |
| Science Achievement         | 29%    | 52%      | 51%   | 40%    | 50%      | 50%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 64%    | 74%      | 72%   | 56%    | 70%      | 70%   |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey |                                   |         |         |          |
|---|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|----------|
| Indicator                                     | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |         | Total    |
|   | 6                                 | 7       | 8       |          |
| Number of students enrolled                   | 98 (0)                            | 112 (0) | 97 (0)  | 307 (0)  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                   | 1 (12)                            | 0 (6)   | 4 (9)   | 5 (27)   |
| One or more suspensions                       | 6 (0)                             | 3 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 9 (0)    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math                 | 10 (4)                            | 6 (1)   | 4 (4)   | 20 (9)   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment               | 29 (57)                           | 32 (43) | 32 (60) | 93 (160) |

**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 |
| 06                    | 2019 | 41%    | 58%      | -17%                       | 54%   | -13%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 41%    | 53%      | -12%                       | 52%   | -11%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 39%    | 56%      | -17%                       | 52%   | -13%                    |

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                       | 2018 | 28%    | 54%      | -26%                       | 51%   | -23%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 11%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 41%    | 60%      | -19%                       | 56%   | -15%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 44%    | 59%      | -15%                       | 58%   | -14%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 13%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                    | 2019 | 34%    | 58%      | -24%                       | 55%   | -21%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 46%    | 56%      | -10%                       | 52%   | -6%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -12%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 28%    | 53%      | -25%                       | 54%   | -26%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 18%    | 52%      | -34%                       | 54%   | -36%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 10%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -18%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 31%    | 40%      | -9%                        | 46%   | -15%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 14%    | 38%      | -24%                       | 45%   | -31%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 17%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 13%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08                    | 2019 | 2%     | 43%      | -41%                       | 48%   | -46%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 40%    | 44%      | -4%                        | 50%   | -10%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -38%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019        | 64%    | 68%      | -4%                   | 67%   | -3%                |
| 2018        | 41%    | 65%      | -24%                  | 65%   | -24%               |
| Compare     |        | 23%      |                       |       |                    |

| CIVICS EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year       | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019       | 61%    | 73%      | -12%                  | 71%   | -10%               |

| CIVICS EOC   |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018         | 49%    | 72%      | -23%                  | 71%   | -22%               |
| Compare      |        | 12%      |                       |       |                    |
| 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         | 75%    | 63%      | 12%                   | 61%   | 14%                |
| 2018         | 30%    | 59%      | -29%                  | 62%   | -32%               |
| Compare      |        | 45%      |                       |       |                    |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 68%    | 54%      | 14%                   | 57%   | 11%                |
| 2018         | 82%    | 54%      | 28%                   | 56%   | 26%                |
| Compare      |        | -14%     |                       |       |                    |

**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                                       | 20       |        |             | 20        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 23       | 50     | 49          | 32        | 55      | 58           | 6        | 50      | 52        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 52       | 63     |             | 24        | 67      |              |          |         | 64        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 40       | 55     | 51          | 44        | 61      | 62           | 29       | 67      | 75        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 42       | 55     | 50          | 41        | 61      | 64           | 30       | 64      | 75        |                   |                     |
| 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 |
| ELL                                       | 15       | 46     | 39          | 20        | 45      | 42           | 16       | 32      | 24        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 36       | 38     |             | 20        | 29      |              |          | 55      | 38        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 38       | 51     | 48          | 35        | 47      | 54           | 41       | 50      | 38        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 38       | 49     | 44          | 33        | 46      | 52           | 42       | 52      | 39        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 14       | 34     | 35          | 23        | 41      | 52           | 28       | 30      | 36        |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| BLK                                       | 29       | 48     |             | 30        | 50      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 34       | 41     | 36          | 40        | 47      | 41           | 38       | 53      | 54        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 35       | 44     | 35          | 39        | 48      | 45           | 40       | 56      | 54        |                   |                     |

### 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  | 52   |
| 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 | 39   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 521  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 20   |
| 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                                       | 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 Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | N/A  |

| Asian Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                    | 54  |
| 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  | 52  |
| 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                                | 52  |
| 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 showing the lowest performance is Science Achievement at 29% proficiency. The contributing factors to this is the limited language proficiency and tier 3 content vocabulary inquisition.

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

The data component demonstrating the greatest decline from the prior year is the Science Achievement from 41 to 29. The contributing factor is the limited english acquisition and vocabulary.

**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 data component demonstrating the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Science at a 22 % points difference. The contributing factor is the number of english language learners, due to their limited english proficiency and vocabulary acquisition.

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

The data demonstrating the most improvement is in the area of Math Learning Gains from 48% to 64%. The school reorganized the teachers assignments, provided intensified instruction, tutoring, and implementation of instructional programs.

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

Two potential areas of concerns reflecting on the EWS Data are Previous Year FSA Level 1 and 2 Score in Lang Arts (English) and Math.

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

The highest priorities for our school wide improvement in the upcoming school year is in Science Achievement.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>#1</b>   |  |
| <b>Title</b>  | If instruction is increased In ELA/Reading, then students' achievement will improve.   |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps to ensure higher level of student Rationale achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment. Teachers follow standards based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Student achievement in English Language Arts will increase by 5 percentage points to 47%.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Stephany Papili (spapili7@dadeschools.net)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Universal Design, Marzano's Taxonomy, and Webb's Depth of Knowledge will continue to be implemented in order to increase the level of rigor in instruction.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps to ensure higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment. Teachers follow standards based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted. Marzano's Taxonomy and Webb's Depth of Knowledge are both scales of cognitive demands to align standards with assessments  |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers will be provided with professional development opportunities pertaining to : Rigor, Unpacking the Standards-ELA, and I-Ready Data Driven Instruction.</li> <li>2. Implementation on IReady online instruction.</li> <li>3. Implementation of extended school day to be used ELA and Math tutorial; 120 mins per week.</li> <li>4. Ellevation in Class for ELL instruction as well as ELL PD.</li> <li>5. Ongoing progress monitoring, every 20 days.</li> <li>6. Biweekly assessments using iReady Standards Mastery.</li> <li>7. Implementaiton of Flocabulary for Vocabulary enrichment.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Stephany Papili (spapili7@dadeschools.net)   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>#2</b>   |  |
| <b>Title</b>  | If instruction is increased in Mathematics, then students' achievement will improve.   |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Aligning learning to standards helps ensure a higher level of student achievement, and Rationale guides teachers in the process of assessment, if teachers follow a standard based instructional model to ensure that their students meet the demands of the learning target.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | <p>Student achievement in 6th Grade General Mathematics will increase by 5 percentage points to 39%.</p> <p>Student achievement in 7th Grade General Mathematics will increase by 5 percentage points to 33%.</p> <p>Student achievement in 8th Grade General Mathematics will increase by 5 percentage points to 36%.</p> <p>Student achievement in Algebra 1 will increase by 5 percentage points to 80%.</p> <p>Student achievement in Geometry will increase by 5 percentage points to 73%.</p>  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Stephany Papili (spapili7@dadeschools.net)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Universal Design, Marzano's Taxonomy, and Webb's Depth of Knowledge will continue to be implemented in order to increase the level of rigor in instruction.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps to ensure higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment. Teachers follow standards based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted. Marzano's Taxonomy and Webb's Depth of Knowledge are both scales of cognitive demands to align standards with assessments  |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers will be provided with professional development opportunities pertaining to iCads Rigor, Carnegie, and IReady Data Driven Instruction (Progress Monitoring) Carnegie, Mathia (Pre-Algebra &amp; Algebra 1 Progress Monitoring) ELLevation in Class (ELL)</li> <li>Implementation of HRW (Geometry Progress Monitoring), PrepWorks, Mathia (Alg.1), iReady Online Instruction (General Math), and Khan Academy (supplement).</li> <li>Implementation of Extended school day to be used for one Math tutoring weekly (60 minutes) .</li> <li>Data Driven Progress Monitoring measured by iReady Standard Mastery (Gen. Math), Topic Assessments (Geom. &amp; Alg.1).</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Stephany Papili (spapili7@dadeschools.net)   |



|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>#3</b>   |   |
| <b>Title</b>  | If instruction is increased in Civics, the students' achievement will improve.  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Aligning learning to standards helps ensure a higher level of student achievement, and Rationale guides teachers in the process of assessment, if teachers follow a standard based instructional model to ensure that their students meet the demands of the learning target.   |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Student achievement in Social Studies (Civics) will increase by 5 percentage points to 66%.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Stephany Papili (spapili7@dadeschools.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Universal Design, Marzano's Taxonomy, and Webb's Depth of Knowledge will continue to be implemented in order to increase the level of rigor in instruction.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps to ensure higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment. Teachers follow standards based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted. Marzano's Taxonomy and Webb's Depth of Knowledge are both scales of cognitive demands to align standards with assessments |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers will be provided with professional development opportunities pertaining to: Rigor</li> <li>2. Unpacking the Standards, ELLevation in the Classroom and iCads</li> <li>3. Implementation of PrepWorks for ongoing progress monitoring.</li> <li>3. Data Driven Assessment measured by Topic Assessments.</li> </ol>                     |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Stephany Papili (spapili7@dadeschools.net)  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>#4</b>   |  |
| <b>Title</b>  | If instruction is increased in Science, the students' achievement will improve.  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Aligning learning to standards helps ensure a higher level of student achievement, and Rationale guides teachers in the process of assessment, if teachers follow a standard based instructional model to ensure that their students meet the demands of the learning target.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Student achievement in Science (8th Grade Comprehensive Science) will increase by 5 percentage points to 7%.<br>Student achievement in Science (Biology) will increase by 5 percentage points to 69%.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Stephany Papili (spapili7@dadeschools.net)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Universal Design, Marzano's Taxonomy, and Webb's Depth of Knowledge will continue to be implemented in order to increase the level of rigor in instruction.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps to ensure higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment. Teachers follow standards based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted. Marzano's Taxonomy and Webb's Depth of Knowledge are both scales of cognitive demands to align standards with assessments  |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers will be provided with professional development opportunities pertaining to: Rigor<br/>Unpacking the Standards, iCads, and ELLevation in the Class.</li> <li>2. Implementation of Gizmos, IXL (General Comprehensive Science), and Edgenuity (Biology).</li> <li>3. Implementation of CIS (comprehension instructional sequence ) CER (claim evidence reason).</li> <li>4. Data Driven Instruction measured by Topic Assessment for ongoing progress monitoring.</li> <li>5. Implementation of after-school tutoring.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Stephany Papili (spapili7@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).**

**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.**

The school's PFEP is attached.

#### **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.**

To ensure that the students social-emotional needs are being met, the school employs a Dean of Students and a guidance counselor to address the counseling, mentoring, and any other guidance services that the student's may need.

Principal – Stephany Papili

Assistant Principal - Federal and State Compliance - Jacqueline Sera-Sirven

Assistant Principal & Instructional Leader-Social Studies-Mildrelis Rieumont

Instructional Leader Mathematics-Mildrelis Rieumont

Exception Student Education (ESE) Instructional Leader –Raquel Mejia

English Language Learner (ELL) Instructional Leader-Mrs Auster

Instructional Leader ELA/Reading- Rommy Saavedra

Instructional Leader-World Language-Lianet Rodriguez

Instructional Leader-Digital Learning-Ruben Saavedra

Instructional Leader-Science-Wajida Qureshi

Technology Specialist – Marcos Padron

School Psychologist – Brenda Johnson

Speech Language Pathologist – Ms. McCalla

Guidance Counselor (Mental Health)– Abinel Marquez

Dean of Students – Novelette Lindsay

Jila Rezaie - Executive Director

Guidance Counselor (Mental Health):

The guidance counselor supports learning through the provision of discussion forums around such key issues as effective program design, through effective assessment strategies and interpersonal relations for our students. The guidance counselor leads many student support services meetings and facilitates the productive outcome that enhances the learning environment for many of our students. The guidance counselor impacts both the affective and effective domains of learning school wide.

Dean of Students:

The Dean of Students will provide interventions; continue to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

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

Our elementary school serves as a feeder pattern school for our middle school; through articulation of students, our students transition from 5th grade to 6th grade. Our 5th grade students, who attend our Elementary school, visit the Secondary school, through a field trip where they meet w/ the sixth grade students, and have an orientation with the teachers, about athletics, courses, and extra curricular activities. Parents are also invited to a 6th grade orientation, which takes place on a parent night. Students who would like to enroll in our sixth grade from outside schools are also invited to the orientation nights for parents, where they learn about the schools mission, vision, and programs. Parent Nights take place at the beginning of the school year. Our guidance counselor follows our students' academic and socio-emotional progress and facilitates the feeder pattern progress throughout our students' K-12 journey. Our middle school is not only housed in the same location as our high school but also serves as a feeder pattern school for our high school; through articulation of students, our students transition from 8th grade to 9th grade. Dual enrollment, Advanced Placement, and Microsoft/Digital Design certification courses are offered throughout our students secondary school years. The IReady program is implemented in our students reading and general math classes to further provide intervention instruction.

**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.**

The eMTSS/RtI Leadership Team to addresses how we can utilize the RtI process to enhance data collection, data analysis, problem solving, differentiated assistance, and progress monitoring.

- The MTSS will meet monthly to discuss data derived from the ongoing interventions and to discuss the problem solving process to support planning, implementing, and evaluating effectiveness of services.
- Administration will monitor instruction and curriculum to ensure students are receiving the correct level of support whether universal, supplemental, or intensive.
- Administration will also monitor the implementation of RtI to ensure compliance with intervention and documentation, provide adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicate with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.
- The Instructional Leader will provide guidance on the K-12 reading plan, facilitate and support data collection activities, assist in data analysis and provide technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning, and support the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.
- Classroom teachers and SPED teachers will provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2 activities.
- The counselor, school psychologist, and other student services personnel will meet with the team to address specific problems/concerns.

The team will implement PD/resources and also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skill as well as an implementation plan.

Behavior will be monitored and managed in the following manner: Student behavior will be monitored using the Student Case Management System (SCAM) referrals, referred to administration/counselor to determine need for further actions including suspensions/expulsions. Based on this data, the school will adjust the delivery of behavior management system.

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

Opportunities are provided for Miami Community Charter High School students since they are in the middle school. Eligible students may take high school course such as Algebra I, Geometry and Biology in the middle school. Moreover, eligible students are identified to participate in dual enrollment from the summer of ninth grade. These groups of students are guided through our dual enrollment program during their high school years.

**Part V: Budget**

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

|  |               |   |  |                 |               |                     |
|--|---------------|---|--|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|
| <b>1</b>   | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: If instruction is increased In ELA/Reading, then students' achievement will improve.</b> |  |                 |               | <b>\$105,342.00</b> |
|  | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus                                 | Funding Source  | FTE           | 2019-20             |
|  | 7730          | 100-Salaries  | 6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School | Title, I Part A |               | \$46,818.00         |
| <i>Notes: Social Studies Teacher Salary</i>  |               |   |  |                 |               |                     |
|  | 7730          | 100-Salaries  | 6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School | Title, I Part A |               | \$44,944.00         |
| <i>Notes: Math Teacher Salary</i>  |               |   |  |                 |               |                     |
|  | 6500          | 519-Technology-Related Supplies   | 6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School | Title, I Part A |               | \$12,080.00         |
| <i>Notes: iReady Reading and Mathematics Online Instruction</i>                        |               |   |  |                 |               |                     |
|  | 3376          | 310-Professional and Technical Services   | 6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School | Title, I Part A |               | \$1,500.00          |
| <i>Notes: iReady Reading and Mathematics Teacher Training Professional Development</i> |               |   |  |                 |               |                     |
| <b>2</b>   | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: If instruction is increased in Mathematics, then students' achievement will improve.</b> |  |                 |               | <b>\$0.00</b>       |
| <b>3</b>   | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: If instruction is increased in Civics, the students' achievement will improve.</b>       |  |                 |               | <b>\$0.00</b>       |
| <b>4</b>   | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: If instruction is increased in Science, the students' achievement will improve.</b>      |  |                 |               | <b>\$0.00</b>       |
|  |               |   |  |                 | <b>Total:</b> | <b>\$105,342.00</b> |