

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Academir Charter School Middle



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

## Academir Charter School Middle

5800 SW 135TH AVE, Miami, FL 33183

www.academircharterschoolmiddle.com

### Demographics

**Principal: Karla Rodriguez**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/19/2015

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	60%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (61%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

N/A

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Table of Contents

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

## Academir Charter School Middle

5800 SW 135TH AVE, Miami, FL 33183

www.academircharterschoolmiddle.com

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	79%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	99%

### School Grades History

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

AcadeMir Charter School Middle (6-8), promotes students' self-motivation to be successful in all subject areas, especially in science, mathematics, reading and technology, by progressively building on their individual talents and abilities. In order to foster students' life-long learning and allow them to reach their full potential as productive, responsible members of today's global and highly technological society, a nurturing, educational environment and the implementation of research- proven educational models will be utilized. These models focus on problem solving, collaboration, and communication through the integration of technology.

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

AcadeMir Charter School Middle (6-8) provides a strong and multifaceted educational foundation for students of all races, backgrounds and abilities that foster their personal growth and intellectual development in order to enable them to make life choices and pursue career paths that will contribute to the advancement of humanity. Students will experience a cross-curricula instructional approach using the new Florida Language Arts and Math Standards as well as the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and benchmarks. Improving Student Achievement will serve as the school's "mantra" and improvement will be facilitated and measured through a systematic and comprehensive organizational approach to leadership and management using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM).

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Espinosa, Paola	Assistant Principal	To assist the Principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer and monitor educational programs that optimize the human and material resources available for a successful and safe school program for students, staff and community.
Triana, Marianne	Principal	
Timilsina, Nabin	Instructional Coach	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Friday 6/19/2015, Karla Rodriguez

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

0

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

0

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

19

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	60%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (61%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## 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	99	124	104	0	0	0	0	327	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	12	0	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	16	9	0	0	0	0	36	

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	5	8	4	0	0	0	0	17

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 6/19/2020

### Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	107	120	0	0	0	0	361	
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	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		



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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
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	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	

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	107	120	0	0	0	0	361	
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	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

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

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

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis****School Data**

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	65%	58%	54%	56%	53%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	58%	54%	47%	55%	54%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	52%	47%	42%	48%	44%
Math Achievement	74%	58%	58%	57%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	62%	56%	57%	49%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	54%	51%	47%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	49%	52%	51%	58%	50%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	74%	72%	77%	70%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

### Grade Level Data

**NOTE:** This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	60%	58%	2%	54%	6%
	2018	59%	53%	6%	52%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	62%	56%	6%	52%	10%
	2018	59%	54%	5%	51%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	69%	60%	9%	56%	13%
	2018	66%	59%	7%	58%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	70%	58%	12%	55%	15%
	2018	65%	56%	9%	52%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	80%	53%	27%	54%	26%
	2018	67%	52%	15%	54%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	42%	40%	2%	46%	-4%
	2018	65%	38%	27%	45%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison		-25%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	37%	43%	-6%	48%	-11%
	2018	42%	44%	-2%	50%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	87%	68%	19%	67%	20%
2018	75%	65%	10%	65%	10%
Compare		12%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	70%	73%	-3%	71%	-1%
2018	64%	72%	-8%	71%	-7%
Compare		6%			
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	80%	63%	17%	61%	19%
2018	94%	59%	35%	62%	32%
Compare		-14%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	54%	46%	57%	43%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Compare		100%			

### Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	28	44	38	39	50	46					
ELL	57	62	60	71	66	69	36	55	67		
HSP	66	62	54	74	62	57	49	71	69		
FRL	64	63	58	75	63	59	51	71	70		
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	33	35		33	65						
ELL	38	59	54	59	71	86	8	63			
HSP	62	61	58	70	70	79	49	67	65		
FRL	60	60	56	67	69	80	54	69	58		
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	44	40		44	40						
ELL	30	40	43	42	40	32	33	53			
HSP	55	47	43	56	49	46	57	77	71		
FRL	53	46	39	55	48	47	52	74	71		

### 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	63
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	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	633
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	61
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	64
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

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

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

Science achievement was the lowest data component; in comparison to 2018, Science achievement was also our lowest component (49%) - there was no increase or decrease . Deficiency in the prior knowledge resulted in the low proficiency in Florida Science Assessment. One of significant trends observed through data analysis of last 3 years data is that deficiency is scattered in all four domains that are tested in the assessment.

**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 was our Mathematics Learning Gains for the L25; there was a twenty-three percentage point decrease from the previous school year (2018) - although we were still slightly above the state (5 points) and district (2 points) averages. The factors that may have contributed to this significant decline may have been the lack of strategic planning for our L25 student body among both the intervention math sessions along with the intensive math instructional sessions. Another factor that contributed to this decline included a lack of targeted individualized instruction for the students in the L25 category.

**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.**

Math proficiency had the greatest gap when compared to the state average with AcadeMir at a 74% achievement level versus the state average of 58% - making that a sixteen point gap. One of the factors is our increase of rigor with standard-aligned bell to bell schedule.

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

Our greatest improvement was in our Social Studies achievement with an increase by five percentage points. We purchased a standard-aligned test preparatory curriculum that resulted in our state assessment growth.

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

One area of concern was the number of students with level 1 on state assessments. The school purchased additional standard-aligned curriculum and online programs to assist and improve student results.

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

1. Science Achievement
2. L25 in ELA
3. L25 in Math
4. ELA and Math Proficiency
5. Social Studies Achievement

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Science Achievement was at 49% in the year 2019-2020 - showing no improvement from the previous school year.

**Measurable Outcome:** By the end of 2020-2021 school year, we will increase our Science achievement by ten percentage points (to at least a 59% achievement rate).

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Nabin Timilsina (nabin@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Through the implementation of a progress monitoring plan along with a standard-aligned platform, there will be a higher use of technology during every Science session/block as well as implementation of standard-aligned curricula that will be closely monitored by both teacher(s) and our science coach.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The digital learning platform implemented is a research-based tool that can be used to both increase student achievement, facilitate remediation and used for instructional purposes.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Identify students with weaknesses.
2. Implementation of the Progress Monitoring Plan for standard mastery check and remediation.
3. Increase grade-level achievement via tutoring and intervention.
4. Utilization of science lab.
5. Integration of new curriculum and Science enrichment opportunities.

**Person Responsible:** Nabin Timilsina (nabin@dadeschools.net)



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on data from FSA ELA 2018 (60% ELA proficiency) and more recent I-Ready AP3 from 2019-2020 (59% proficient), the current seventh grade class needs to increase and improve the proficiency level.

**Measurable Outcome:** By the end of the current school year (2020-2021), the ELA proficiency for the 7th grade class will improve by at least five percentage points (to at least 65%) in the Florida Standards Assessment data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Paola Espinosa (pespinosa@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Via standard-aligned instruction and targeted tutoring with the support of Mrs. Espinosa and Ms. Sosa, Academir's Reading Coach, the ELA proficiency will improve by the end of the school year. Both 2020-2021 FSA data as well as I-Ready Reading (AP3) will highlight these gains.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Academir has utilized these research-based strategies for all grade levels (6-8) in the last two years - the results from learning gains to proficiency have been significant (over 10% percentage point growth) across these areas for English Language Arts.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Identify areas of weaknesses (ELA cluster and standards)
2. Create a targeted instructional plan via intervention and/or after-school tutoring
3. Monitor ongoing data
4. Assess students via standard-aligned platforms (I-ready and USA Test Prep)
5. Remediate/Reteach any areas of need

**Person Responsible:** Paola Espinosa (pespinosa@dadeschools.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**The school will continue to monitor all students progress and provide additional support (tutoring and intervention). The administration will have data chats with teachers after assessments have been given to students in order to monitor student progress.**

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

AcadeMir Charter School Middle takes a pride in assuring that a positive school culture and environment is present at all times. Through our various communication vehicles, the leadership team is continuously communicating important topics to all stakeholders involved: teachers, parents, community leaders and students.

Clear expectations are delivered prior to the beginning of the school year and remain continuous from administration and teachers to students and families, in the areas of behavior and high quality instruction. Teachers receive training on research-based practices such as the components and implementation of our Positive Behavioral System (PBS); this is then shared with students on the very first day of school along with their families.

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

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

### **Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00