Sports Leadership And Management Charter School Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sports Leadership And Management Charter School Middle School

604 NW 12 AVE, Miami, FL 33136

www.slammiami.com

Demographics

Principal: Rey Breto

Start Date for this Principal: 9/7/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	72%
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: C (51%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Sports Leadership And Management Charter School Middle School

604 NW 12 AVE, Miami, FL 33136

www.slammiami.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	95%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	98%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	D	C

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of SLAM Charter Middle School is to provide an innovative and in-depth secondary educational program that produces college-bound students through emphasis on sports-related majors and post-secondary preparation.

SLAM engages students in:
Sports-infused lessons that develop
Lifelong learners who persistently pursue
Academic and personal excellence and are
Motivated to become world changers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

SLAM will engage all students in: Sports infused lessons that develop Lifelong learners who persistently pursue Academic and personal excellence and are Motivated to become future world changers.

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
Breto, Rey	Principal	
Fernandez, Patricia	Administrative Support	Academic Advisor
Frawley, Jeff	School Counselor	CAP Advisor
Gomez, Andrea	Administrative Support	Lead Teacher
Abascal, Mercedes	Assistant Principal	
Tellechea, Patricia	Assistant Principal	
Mas, Ana	Teacher, ESE	ESE Program Specialist
Matos, Wilmer	Dean	Lead Teacher & Dean of Discipline & Attendance
De La Cruz, Barbara	School Counselor	School Counselor
Mendoza, Julio	Administrative Support	
Brown, Nicole	Instructional Coach	Math Instructional Coach and PLC Liaison
Thompson, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	Reading Instructional Coach & PLC Liaison
Micek, Thomas	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair & PLC Member
Aguilar, Francis	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair & PLC Member
Martin, Alexandra	Teacher, ESE	Services ESE Students
Casas, Jose	Administrative Support	ESOL Chairperson

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 9/7/2020, Rey Breto

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
60

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	72%
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: C (51%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	281	339	295	0	0	0	0	915
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	15	10	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	5	0	0	0	0	20
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	
Level 1 on the 2018 statewide ELA Assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	83	50	0	0	0	0	208
Level 1 on the 2018 statewide Math Assessments	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	90	80	0	0	0	0	270

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	180	150	120	0	0	0	0	450

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	8	5	3	0	0	0	0	16
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
Tuesday 9/8/2020

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	300	300	300	0	0	0	0	900
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	14	10	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	85	70	0	0	0	0	245

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	174	165	162	0	0	0	0	501

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	10	5	4	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3

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	300	300	300	0	0	0	0	900
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	14	10	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	85	70	0	0	0	0	245

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	174	165	162	0	0	0	0	501

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	10	5	4	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	48%	58%	54%	50%	53%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	58%	54%	49%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	52%	47%	43%	48%	44%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	42%	58%	58%	54%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	44%	56%	57%	56%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	54%	51%	57%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	42%	52%	51%	46%	50%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	60%	74%	72%	68%	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	44%	58%	-14%	54%	-10%
	2018	37%	53%	-16%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	47%	56%	-9%	52%	-5%
	2018	30%	54%	-24%	51%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
08	2019	48%	60%	-12%	56%	-8%
	2018	44%	59%	-15%	58%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	28%	58%	-30%	55%	-27%
	2018	34%	56%	-22%	52%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	45%	53%	-8%	54%	-9%
	2018	37%	52%	-15%	54%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
08	2019	41%	40%	1%	46%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	47%	38%	9%	45%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	37%	43%	-6%	48%	-11%
	2018	13%	44%	-31%	50%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	0%	68%	-68%	67%	-67%
2018	94%	65%	29%	65%	29%
Compare		-94%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	59%	73%	-14%	71%	-12%
2018	42%	72%	-30%	71%	-29%
Compare		17%			
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	69%	63%	6%	61%	8%
2018	89%	59%	30%	62%	27%
Compare		-20%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%

Subgroup Data

	2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	27	44	38	34	45		30	50			
ELL	38	49	43	34	42	53	32	54	61		
BLK	48	41	46	43	35	39	25	49	65		
HSP	48	53	48	42	45	54	45	63	71		
WHT	47	60		27	53						
FRL	49	52	48	41	43	52	42	61	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	20	36	38	24	42	50		25			
ELL	17	35	38	24	32	46	8	21			
BLK	37	42	60	44	36	29	13	68	46		
HSP	38	43	38	43	43	45	23	41	43		
FRL	37	43	39	42	43	45	21	43	43		
	2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	23	41	38	29	57	57					
ELL	22	39	30	30	46	45	14	54			
BLK	56	44	42	63	51	33	48	70	53		
HSP	49	50	42	53	57	61	46	68	45		
WHT	44	44		38	44						
FRL	49	48	42	54	55	58	46	68	43		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	528
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
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	43
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	54
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 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	47
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	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.

According to the 2019 School Data Map, Mathematics received an overall 46 percent proficiency rating, Although this only demonstrates a one percent decrease from the 2017-2018 data results, our math learning gains and our lowest 25th percentile did increase. When compared to 2017-2018, our lowest 25th percentile increased by eight percent and our learning gains by two percentage points. This data is impactful because it reveals a need for additional support within the Mathematics Department.

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

According to the 2019 School Data Map, our 6th Grade students achieved an overall 28 percent proficiency rating on the FSA, Mathematics; resulting in a six percentage point decrease compared to 2017-2018. The School Data Map also demonstrated a drop within the English Language Learners (ELL) over the course of the last two years. In 2017, ELL's overall math proficiency decreased by 2 percentage points. This data is impactful because it reveals a need for additional support for ELL students in math literacy.

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.

According to the 2018-2019 School Data Map, SLAM ELA's lowest 25th percentile evidenced an eight percentage point increase, and surpassed state results by one percent. SLAM ELA also had an increase of ten percentage points within the overall learning gains component, This data finding is of great value as it proves that the ELA's commitment to rigorous coursework as well as technology integration continues to yield proficiency growth.

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

According to the 2018-2109 School Data Map, grade 8 science proficiency increased by twenty-one percentage points. These data findings are significantly impactful because they prove that the support collaboration model utilized in the science classes is effective.

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

Although the number of students with more than one disciplinary referral decreased from 15% to 8% on the 2018-2019 school survey, the number of students with one referral increased from 14% to 20%.This data finding is impactful because it shows that while the school attempted to address disciplinary concerns for repeated behaviors by using different, often less punitive measures, the number of students earning one referral still increased.

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

1. Shared Vision and Leadership
2. Fostering Characteristics of high-performing Professional Learning Communities
3. Data-Driven Instruction
4. Technology Integration
5. Fidelity to Differentiated Instruction

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The School's Leadership Team (SLT) is committed to working alongside of its instructional coaches, teachers, and all stakeholders in an joint effort to improve positive student outcomes.
	If rigor, relevance, relationships, and the framework of Differentiated Instruction (D.I) is infused across all content areas during Instruction, then student achievement will increase.
Measurable Outcome:	In an effort to promote positive student outcomes for ELL students in Math literacy, the SLT will engage in the continuous progress monitoring by conducting bi-weekly data chats. In the effort to increase Math learning gains, the SLT will monitor instructional practices and pacing in the core and intensive math classes, as well engage the team in ongoing data discussions.
	Additionally, the school's leadership team will set short and long-term goals for the lowest 25% within ELA and Math cores and actively track the group's progress. As the School Improvement Plan unfolds, the team will modify/ refine its action steps as needed to ensure academic success for the lowest 25%. through the use of differentiated instruction, the team will work to ensure that teachers emerge in reflective data discussions routinely and that they provide instructional feedback, following walk-throughs, biweekly and monthly throughout the year
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mercedes Abascal (mabascal@slammiami.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The School's Leadership Team (SLT) is committed to working alongside of its instructional coaches, teachers, and all stakeholders in an joint effort to improve positive student outcomes. The administrative team currently meets with teachers and department leaders both formally and informally, biweekly, to discuss emergent and summative data, address and modifyinstructional concerns, and acknowledge areas of growth. Additionally, the School Leadership Team works to develop others by allotting time during faculty meetings for the sharing of instructional strategies and best practices. The team strives to empower teachers by fostering a culture of shared-best practices. The team further provides teachers with guidance on how to use emergent data to guide targeted differentiated instruction and provides feedback on instructional delivery following daily and weekly walkthroughs. It works toward the development of the School Improvement Process and its implementation steps every quarter.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The SLT will work toward the development of the School Improvement Process and its implementation steps every quarter. Professional learning atthe school site is not only purposeful, but developed based on staff needs. The team further strives to extend leadership opportunities to all interested staff. In an effort to sustain the growth of technology integration, the SLT will continue to promote standards-based and student-centered learning through technology integration. Lastly, the SLT's shared outcome for the 2019-2020 is to build capacity among all teachers and students through the use of Differentiated Instruction (DI) and Creating Independence through Student centered activities. It is through these methods that students will receive a more personalized approach to learning; resulting in higher student success and achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Shared Vision and Leadership

Person Responsible	Rey Breto (rbreto@slammiami.com)

Fostering Characteristics of high-performing Professional Learning Communities

Person Responsible	Mercedes Abascal (mabascal@slammiami.com)

Data-Driven Instruction

Person Responsible	Patricia Tellechea (ptellechea@slammiami.com)

Technology Integration

Person Responsible	Andrea Gomez (agomez@slammiami.com)

Fidelity to Differentiated Instruction

Person Responsible	Mercedes Abascal (mabascal@slammiami.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

English Language Learner engagement in core classes remains an area of potential growth. Anecdotal evidence
collected during Instructional Rounds and formative assessments suggest that English Language Learners
need additional support in the area of mathematic and especially in high-accountability courses, **where engagement and student performance remains below expectations, despite implementation goals.**
The SLT Team will continue to examine the data map for evidence of positive and negative trends. The SLT will then review Academic Programs and revisit the data maps to look for evidence of goal attainment/progress. After
discussing the evidence, the SLT will meet with the the high accountability departments to **interpret the evidence and provide additional insight. Based on the SLT's initial interpretation and feedback, the SLT will reconvene to consider whether the school's current essential practices for School Culture or Academic Programs need to be changed or refined. Instructional rounds will be a key practice and vital indicator as data is considered alongside insights gleaned from the Mid-Year Data.**

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.

SLAM High School strives to provide all students with the opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. SLAM's Student Services Department develops a yearly Curriculum Bulletin that provides students as well as parents with the courses offered along with a brief description of each course. The Curriculum Bulletin indicates several options for academies and tracks for students to choose from. School counselors conduct presentations to all students by class and grade levels and assist students in the selection of courses by completing the Subject Selection Form. In addition, counselors review school individual course plans to assure that students are enrolled in courses that align with the students' future career goals. SLAM's CAP Advisor further enhances student awareness of careers and college options through the use of the school website, regular meetings and classroom visits. Parent academies, student
orientations, community involvement sessions and student peers help with the process of team building within the school. Constant communication between the stakeholders is essential to the success of the student. Collaborated events between the school and home are established to support parental engagement with the school. These events include but are not limited to: EESAC meetings, Student and Parent Orientation Meetings, Zoom Town Hall Virtual Meetings, Back to School Night, Parent/Teacher Conferences, and Student Parent Association (SPA) meetings. Additionally, SLAM Middle School implements a school-wide life skills program designed as an "Advisory Period" to enhance the overall human performance in and out of school grounds. Topics discussed correlate with relevant concepts pertaining to each of the student's grade level and academic expectations. Such topics include but are not limited to study skills, interpersonal conflict, goal-setting, social emotional learning, overcoming setbacks, building confidence, problem solving tactics, life skills for school and beyond, game plans for college, and post-secondary success awareness.

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: Professional Learning Communities				$370,364.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	6015 - Slam Charter Middle School	Title, I Part A		$45,726.00
			Notes: Curriculum Support Specialist, Instructional Support			

	2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	6015 - Slam Charter Middle School	Title, I Part A		$44,078.00
			Notes: Math Instructional Coach			
	2110	160-Other Support Personnel	6015 - Slam Charter Middle School	Title, I Part A		$16,000.00
			Notes: Community Involvement Specialist/Parental Involvement Support Personnel			
	2110	160-Other Support Personnel	6015 - Slam Charter Middle School	Title, I Part A		$194,560.00
			Notes: Interventionist Tier II & Tier III			
	2110	120-Classroom Teachers	6015 - Slam Charter Middle School	Title, I Part A		$70,000.00
			Notes: 7th Period Supplement & Advisory			
					Total:	**$370,364.00**