

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Sports Leadership Arts Management Charter High



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Sports Leadership Arts Management Charter High School

604 NW 12 AVE, Miami, FL 33136

www.slammiami.com

Demographics

Principal: Rey Breto

Start Date for this Principal: 9/8/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	73%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Sports Leadership Arts Management Charter High 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)
High School 9-12	Yes	93%
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	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of SLAM Academy High 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	Middle & High School Counselor
Frawley, Jeff	Dean	CAP Advisor
De La Cruz, Barbara	School Counselor	
Gomez, Andrea	Dean	Lead Teacher
Lozano, Edel	Teacher, K-12	Electives & Foreign Language Department Chair
Fernandez, Patricia	Other	Academic Advisor
Abascal, Mercedes	Assistant Principal	
Tellechea, Patricia	Assistant Principal	
Brown, Nicole	Instructional Coach	Middle School Math Instructional Coach & PLC Liaison
Thompson, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	ELA & Reading Instructional Coach & PLC Liaison
SanMartin, Iliana	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair
Diaz, Emerio	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair
Matos, Wilmer	Dean	Lead Teacher & Supervisor Over Attendance & Discipline

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 9/8/2020, 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

50

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	73%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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	311	181	150	189	831
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	0	2	15
One or more suspensions	0	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	0	
Course failure in Math	0	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	58	37	38	27	160
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	40	25	15	130

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	150	80	60	60	350	

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	2	2	1	2	7	
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	0	0	0	175	160	197	155	687	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	20	15	10	80	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	2	9	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	10	10	3	43	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	50	28	5	157	

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	80	68	55	25	228	

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	19	16	16	15	66
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3	8

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	0	0	0	0	175	160	197	155	687
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	20	15	10	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	2	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	10	10	3	43
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	50	28	5	157

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	80	68	55	25	228

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	19	16	16	15	66
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3	8

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	50%	59%	56%	47%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	54%	51%	45%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	48%	42%	38%	45%	41%
Math Achievement	46%	54%	51%	45%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	44%	52%	48%	53%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	51%	45%	49%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	65%	68%	68%	54%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	76%	73%	61%	71%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	45%	55%	-10%	55%	-10%
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	53%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	52%	53%	-1%	53%	-1%
	2018	51%	54%	-3%	53%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	68%	-6%	67%	-5%
2018	63%	65%	-2%	65%	-2%
Compare		-1%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	74%	71%	3%	70%	4%
2018	44%	67%	-23%	68%	-24%
Compare		30%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	32%	63%	-31%	61%	-29%
2018	48%	59%	-11%	62%	-14%
Compare		-16%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	54%	7%	57%	4%
2018	35%	54%	-19%	56%	-21%
Compare		26%			

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	23	69									
ELL	25	50	51	37	36	27	48	53		75	92
BLK	69	59		47	37		82	67			
HSP	48	54	51	46	45	30	63	76		93	90
FRL	51	57	51	45	44	31	67	77		97	88
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	54	50		18	21		60				
ELL	6	22	23	18	36	48	30			92	100
BLK	57	62		43	40		64				
HSP	49	49	36	41	43	45	65	46		97	99
FRL	52	51	37	41	42	48	67	44		96	99
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	40	57		28	41						
ELL	14	39	35	28	47	45	18				
BLK	39	37		33	25						
HSP	47	46	41	45	56	51	52	62		93	98
WHT				70	60						

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
FRL	45	44	37	45	54	48	52	64		88	97

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	60
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
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	659
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	50
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	60
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	60
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	
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	61
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 demonstrates a four percent increase from the 2017-2018 data results, our lowest learning gains were significantly impacted by a

decrease of 18 percentage points. This data is impactful because it reveals a need for additional support toward our lowest 25 percentile in Mathematics.

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 Algebra 1 students achieved an overall 32 percent proficiency rating on the FSA, Algebra 1 EOC; resulting in a sixteen 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, our ELL lowest 25 percentile decreased by 20 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 25 percentile evidenced a fourteen percentage point increase, and an overall 9 percentage point upward trend within the same component, when compared to state results. SLAM ELA also had an increase of four percentage points within the overall learning gains component, when compared to the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 state results. 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, Social Studies proficiency increased by thirty-one percentage points. These data findings are significantly impactful because they prove that the support collaboration model utilized in the US History classes is effective. Furthermore, although it notes an area of notable improvement and it also suggests an area of potential growth when compared to the performance of other Tier 2 schools.

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:	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>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 modify instructional 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</p> <p>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.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>The SLT will work toward the development of the School Improvement Process and its implementation steps every quarter. Professional learning at the 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</p> <p>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.</p>

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 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				\$223,769.70
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	7016 - Sports Leadership Arts Management Charter Hs	Title, I Part A		\$44,007.00
			Notes: ELA/Reading Instructional Coach			

	2110	160-Other Support Personnel	7016 - Sports Leadership Arts Management Charter Hs	Title, I Part A		\$97,280.00
			<i>Notes: Intervention, Tier II & III Support</i>			
	2110	160-Other Support Personnel	7016 - Sports Leadership Arts Management Charter Hs	Title, I Part A		\$16,000.00
			<i>Notes: Community Involvement Specialist</i>			
	2110	120-Classroom Teachers	7016 - Sports Leadership Arts Management Charter Hs	Title, I Part A		\$66,482.70
			<i>Notes: Advisement Period</i>			
Total:						\$223,769.70