Miami Community Charter School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Miami Community Charter School

101 S REDLAND RD, Florida City, FL 33034

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Mildrelis Rieumont

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2017

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2019-20 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* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: F (27%) 2015-16: D (34%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Miami Community Charter School

101 S REDLAND RD, Florida City, FL 33034

[no web address on file]

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)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	98%

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	B	B	C	F

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Alba-Quesada, Maria	Principal	
Fiallo, Raina	Assistant Principal	
Rodriguez, Romy	Teacher, ESE	
Rodriguez, Lianet	Teacher, K-12	
Delgado, Ashley	Instructional Coach	
Lopez, Karinne	Teacher, K-12	
Rezaie, Jila	Other	Executive Director
Olmo, Jenifer	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/15/2017, Mildrelis Rieumont

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2019-20 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* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: F (27%) 2015-16: D (34%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/3/2020

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	81	87	93	93	89	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	534
Attendance below 90 percent	1	6	6	3	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	5	7	15	17	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on statewide assessment	1	10	28	11	55	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152

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	1	4	14	12	38	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	4	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	1	0	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	81	87	93	93	89	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	534
Attendance below 90 percent	1	6	6	3	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	5	7	15	17	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on statewide assessment	1	10	28	11	55	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152

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	1	4	14	12	38	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	4	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	1	0	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	52%	62%	57%	33%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	72%	62%	58%	30%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	58%	53%	25%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	69%	63%	35%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains	54%	66%	62%	25%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	55%	51%	21%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	55%	53%	17%	52%	51%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey						
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(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.

ELA							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	40%	60%	-20%	58%	-18%	
	2018	32%	61%	-29%	57%	-25%	
Same Grade Comparison		8%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	60%	64%	-4%	58%	2%	
	2018	49%	60%	-11%	56%	-7%	
Same Grade Comparison		11%					
Cohort Comparison		28%					
05	2019	53%	60%	-7%	56%	-3%	
	2018	44%	59%	-15%	55%	-11%	
Same Grade Comparison		9%					
Cohort Comparison		4%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	50%	67%	-17%	62%	-12%	
	2018	43%	67%	-24%	62%	-19%	
Same Grade Comparison		7%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	64%	69%	-5%	64%	0%	
	2018	55%	68%	-13%	62%	-7%	
Same Grade Comparison		9%					
Cohort Comparison		21%					
05	2019	42%	65%	-23%	60%	-18%	
	2018	30%	66%	-36%	61%	-31%	
Same Grade Comparison		12%					
Cohort Comparison		-13%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	39%	53%	-14%	53%	-14%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	30%	56%	-26%	55%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
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	13	64		33	27						
ELL	47	71	63	47	48	37	30				
BLK	62	64		77	91						
HSP	51	73	70	52	52	42	37				
FRL	51	73	68	53	55	46	40				
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				8							
ELL	32	55	55	40	45	40	12				
BLK	32	69		32	54						
HSP	42	64	52	44	49	44	31				
FRL	41	64	53	43	50	42	31				
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	26	26	24	30	29	22	11				
BLK	37	15		37	8						
HSP	33	31	27	35	26	21	19				
FRL	34	30	23	35	26	22	18				

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	56
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	61

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	51
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	74
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
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	
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 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	56
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.

The data component with the lowest performance, was Science (5th grade). The contributing factor to the last year's low performance, can be contributed to the lack of academic language, and vocabulary which is contributed to the fact that 35% of 5th grader students were ELL students, and 42% were former ELL students.

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

The Lowest 25% in Mathematics had the greatest decline from the prior year. he contributing factor to the last year's low performance, can be contributed to the lack of academic language, and vocabulary which is contributed to the fact that 46% of the students at Miami Community Charter School are ELL learners, while 14% are former ELL learners.

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 that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Science Achievement. The factor that contributed to this gap was the high ELL

population at our school. ELL learners struggle with acquiring language and retaining the Tier 3 vocabulary pertaining to science content.

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 the ELA Lowest 25%. The new actions that were taken that contributed to this improvement were: daily intervention, extended school day tutoring sessions, teacher training and professional development.

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

The area of concern based on the EWS data from Part I (D), is "Level 1 on statewide assessment" 152 students have scored a Level 1 (or equivalent) on the statewide assessments.

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

1. Lowest 25% Mathematics Gains
2. 5th Grade Math Proficiency
3. Grade 3 ELA Proficiency
4. Lowest 25% ELA Gains
5. 5th Grade Science

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Differentiate instruction with a focus on rigor in all content areas to increase student growth.The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps to ensure higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	Student achievement in all data components will increase by 5 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	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 will set learning intentions, and use the Cognia Standards, in order to plan backwards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers follow standards based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted. 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

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will be provided with professional development opportunities
pertaining to :
-Rigor
-Cognia Standards
-Universal Design and Backwards Planning-Learning Intentions
2. Differentiated Instruction, based on formative and summative
assessments including biweekly i-Ready Standards Mastery assessments
(Reading and Math), Houghton Mifflin-Journey's Standards Based
Assessments (Biweekly-Reading Grades K-2); Topic Assessments (Science Grade 5).
3. i-Ready ELA and Math online platform is used as ongoing progress
monitoring tool, for Assessment Period 1, 2, and 3. Growth monitoring checks
take place every 20 instructional days to monitor remedial instruction.
4. Interventions are scheduled based on ongoing progress monitoring (TII (150 minutes weekly) TIII 210
minutes weekly) for ELA and Math, using iReady toolkit
5. Weekly walk throughs to monitor the delivery of instruction.
6. Intervention is provided daily for students in Tier 3, and 3 times weekly for
students in Tier 2, the i-Ready instructional grouping profile indicates which
skills students need remediation in and provides the instructional resources
to provide the intervention.
7. During the school day tutoring, is scheduled for students categorized in
the Lowest 25% of Reading, and Mathematics.
8. Topic Assessments are used in 5th Grade Science as an ongoing progress monitoring tool for 3rd,

4th and 5th grade Science.
9. A paraprofessional is assigned to 5th grade Science classes, to provide additional support and remediation based on the results of the Science topic assessments, and the data from 5th Grade Science Topic Assessments.
10. A Reading coach is assigned to small groups during Reading classes, and assigned to mentor the new teachers, and collaborate with teachers in grades 3rd through 5th, to disaggregate biweekly data, and monitor and guide the lesson planning process, as well as the delivery of instruction.
10. A Mathematics coach is assigned to small groups during Math classes, and assigned to mentor the new teachers, and collaborate with teachers in grades 3rd through 5th to disaggregate biweekly data, and monitor and guide the lesson planning process, as well as the delivery of instruction.
11. A science instructional leader is assigned to work with our STEAM program.
12. ELL coordinator/Liaison is assigned to work with teachers to implement WIDA Can do Descriptors, and methodology as well supporting the delivery of instruction, and implementing ESOL strategies in instruction.

Person Responsible   Maria Alba-Quesada (malbaquesada@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

.

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.

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

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: Standards-aligned Instruction				$171,015.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0102 - Miami Community Charter School	General Fund		$31,840.00
			Notes: I-Ready Online Program Math and ELA			
			0102 - Miami Community Charter School	Title, I Part A		$31,840.00
			Notes: Full Time Interventionist Math and Science			
			0102 - Miami Community Charter School	Title, I Part A		$0.00
			Notes: Full Time Interventionist Reading			
			0102 - Miami Community Charter School	Title, I Part A		$15.00
			Notes: ESOL Support Specialist			
			0102 - Miami Community Charter School	General Fund		$22,910.00
			Notes: Math Coach			
			0102 - Miami Community Charter School	General Fund		$22,910.00
			Notes: ESE Specialist			
			0102 - Miami Community Charter School	Title, I Part A		$56,000.00
			Notes: Reading Coach			
			0102 - Miami Community Charter School			$5,500.00
			Notes: Science Coach			
					Total:	$171,015.00