Downtown Miami Charter School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Downtown Miami Charter School

305 NW 3RD AVE, Miami, FL 33128

http://www.downtowncharter.org

Demographics

Principal: Nicolas Bardoni

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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)	83%
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: C (52%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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

Downtown Miami Charter School

305 NW 3RD AVE, Miami, FL 33128

http://www.downtowncharter.org

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	86%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	97%

School Grades History

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

DMCS fosters our passion for learning by inspiring leaders through the arts and sciences.

Provide the school's vision statement.

DMCS will be the community model for providing exceptional, interdisciplinary educational experiences and establishing diverse partnerships within our 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
Padierne Delgado, Amanda	Principal	
McDonald, Aldin	Dean	
Ruiz, Berna	Instructional Coach	
Mehler , Leah	Teacher, K-12	
Anglade , Roselyn	Assistant Principal	
Santos, Cassandra	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Nicolas Bardoni

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)	83%
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: C (52%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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	80	100	83	87	91	75	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	599
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	19	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	3	3	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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

Wednesday 9/9/2020

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	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 or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	7	5	5	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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	109	85	91	98	87	98	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	641
Attendance below 90 percent	7	11	13	23	21	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	1	0	4	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	5	2	4	7	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	20	21	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	7	5	5	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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	58%	62%	57%	56%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	62%	58%	57%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	58%	53%	52%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	69%	63%	64%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains	52%	66%	62%	69%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	55%	51%	58%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	46%	55%	53%	41%	52%	51%

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	Total
EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
	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	59%	60%	-1%	58%	1%	
	2018	61%	61%	0%	57%	4%	
Same Grade Comparison	-2%						
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	62%	64%	-2%	58%	4%	
	2018	59%	60%	-1%	56%	3%	
Same Grade Comparison	3%						
Cohort Comparison	1%						
05	2019	46%	60%	-14%	56%	-10%	
	2018	52%	59%	-7%	55%	-3%	
Same Grade Comparison	-6%						
Cohort Comparison	-13%						

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	66%	67%	-1%	62%	4%	
	2018	66%	67%	-1%	62%	4%	
Same Grade Comparison	0%						
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	60%	69%	-9%	64%	-4%	
	2018	76%	68%	8%	62%	14%	
Same Grade Comparison	-16%						
Cohort Comparison	-6%						
05	2019	43%	65%	-22%	60%	-17%	
	2018	55%	66%	-11%	61%	-6%	
Same Grade Comparison	-12%						
Cohort Comparison	-33%						

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	43%	53%	-10%	53%	-10%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	43%	56%	-13%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	27	38	25	23	33	43					
ELL	62	62	48	63	49	47	59				
BLK	51	47	54	57	46	28	33				
HSP	66	60	52	68	58	67	72				
FRL	57	54	56	61	52	40	45				
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	17	35	38	25	40	33					
ELL	45	60	73	57	72	57					
BLK	56	55	55	70	76	66	41				
HSP	62	61	67	71	74	55	38				
FRL	57	58	62	70	74	61	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	11	45	64	26	50	46					
ELL	48	59	64	67	76	69					
BLK	52	54	47	60	66	51	40				
HSP	62	62	61	71	73	68	42				
FRL	55	57	50	63	68	56	40				

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	56

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	56
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	45
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	62
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	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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance for the 18-19 school year was learning gains of Mathematics scholars in the lowest 25th percentile. This performance indicator can be attributed to many factors including, teacher experience, teacher turnover and lack of targeted small group instruction in the mathematics subject area. For the 2019-2020 school year, although, we did not have state assessment data due to school closure for COVID 19, we did see an increase in performance data of scholars in the lowest 25th percentile for mathematics. According, to I-Ready Winder Diagnostic Data only 7% of scholars were considered tier 3 at risk scholars for the mathematics subject area.

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 from prior years was overall Mathematics Learning Gains. with a total decline of 23% points. This can be attributed to teacher experience, teacher turnover and lack of small group instruction in the mathematics subject area. For the 2019-2020 year school we focused on targeted standards aligned small group instruction in the mathematics subject area, and saw great improvements in this area based on I-Ready Diagnostic Data.

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 had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Mathematics Learning Gains and Mathematics Lowest 25th Percentile, each performing 10% points below the state average. The biggest factor that contributed to large percentage gap is Mathematics Instruction not reaching the level of complexity of the standard. In the 2019-2020, school year we focused on level of complexity in mathematics instruction, and was able to identify 49% of scholars as tier 2 in mathematics and 44% of scholars as tier 1 in mathematics, based on I-Ready Diagnostic Data.

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 Science. This can be attributed to the implementation of a new science curriculum, that focused on hands on inquiry based science instruction. In the 2019-2020 school year, we continued with to use and implement this same curriculum with fidelity in hopes of seeing even more science growth.

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

Based on our reflection of the Early Warning Signs an area of concern for our school is Lowest 25th percentile in both reading and mathematics. Although, not many scholars showed more than one early warning indicator, those did were identified in the Lowest 25th percentile in both of these academic subjects. Ensuring scholars receive the tiered support they need in both subjects will be essential for our success in the 2020-2021 school year.

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

1. Lowest 25th Percentile
2. Mathematics Instruction
3. ELA Instruction

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The first area of concern is the overall school wide math instruction. From 2018 to 2019 there was a decrease of 9 percentage points in mathematics achievement and we also saw a large decrease in mathematics learning gains. In 2019 2020 we saw improvement in overall math performance based on the IReady diagnostic data. This is identified as one of our key areas of focus because we want to ensure we maintain the growth we did make.
Measurable Outcome:	Our measurable outcome for mathematics achievement will be to reach 65% overall proficiency of 2020 -2021 FSA or 65% overall proficiency of IReady data from fall to spring .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Berna Ruiz (bruiz@downtowncharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher instructional strategies outlined by Robert Marzano.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Robert Marzano's book, What Works in Schools , factors that influence student performance include instructional strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Tiered Small Group Instruction
2. On- Going Progress Monitoring
3. Providing Feedback

Person Responsible Berna Ruiz (bruiz@downtowncharter.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We have identified ELA Instructional Practice as one of our areas of focus based on 18-19 FSA data and 19-20 I-Ready Diagnostic Data. Although, there was not drastic difference between 17-18 ELA data and 18-19 data we did see declines in ELA Learning Gain and Overall ELA Achievement. In addition, our Reading I-Ready Winter Data identified 15% of scholars as at risk and in need of tier 3 intervention and 40% of scholars in need of tier 2 intervention. This shows that more than 50% of scholars are 1 more grade levels behind where they should be for the ELA subject area.
Measurable Outcome:	Our measurable outcome for ELA achievement will be to reach 65% overall proficiency of 2020 -2021 FSA or 65% overall proficiency of IReady data from fall to spring .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Berna Ruiz (bruiz@downtowncharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher instructional strategies outlined by Robert Marzano.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Robert Marzano's book, What Works in Schools , factors that influence student performance include instructional strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Tiered Small Group Instruction
2. On Going Progress Monitoring
3. Feedback Protocols

Person Responsible	Berna Ruiz (bruiz@downtowncharter.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	For the 2020-2021 school year we are offering families the option to choose between 3 Education Models for their scholar Full Mobile, Fully In-Person, or Flexible (in person and mobile). This is a new of way of instruction of educators and scholars, and we want ensure that we are establishing best practices that support scholar engagement. We understand that there is a high correlation between student engagement and student success and want to ensure set and maintain the standard for scholar engagement in each of our educational models.
Measurable Outcome:	Our attendance for each model of education will be 80% based on quarterly attendance data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cassandra Santos (csantos@downtowncharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher instructional strategies outlined by Robert Marzano and Doug Lemov.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Robert Marzano's book, What Works in Schools , factors that influence student performance include instructional strategies. Additionally, Doug Lemov discuss the importance of scholar engagement in his book, Teach Like a Champion.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor Scholar Attendance
2. Coaching Cycle
3. Feedback Protocol
4. Professional Development

Person Responsible Aldin McDonald (amcdonald@downtowncharter.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We have identified professional development as an area of focus for our school, as we want to ensure our teachers are well equipped to provide scholars with the very best educational opportunities. This school year we will be offering families 3 Models of education to choose for their scholar Fully Mobile, Fully In Person, Flexible (in person and mobile), through professional development we will ensure are teachers have the necessary knowledge and resources to support scholars in each of these education models.
Measurable Outcome:	All instructional staff will attend 100% content applicable professional development opportunities organized by the school as evidenced by professional development sign in sheets.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Roselyn Anglade (ranglad@downtowncharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy will be to follow the principles and guidelines of the Professional Learning Support Teams.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	They PLST provides research based practices for planning and delivering continuous professional development for teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. My Learning Plan
2. Professional Development Calendar

Person Responsible	Roselyn Anglade (ranglad@downtowncharter.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

In addition, to these focuses another identified area of improvement for the school is monitoring and progress of scholars identified in the lowest 25th percentile in both reading and mathematics. The leadership team will make this an area of priority by conducting monthly growth monitoring checks for scholars identified in this category. At least 1 data chat a quarter will be focused on scholars in the lowest 25th percentile so that teachers can adjust their instruction as needed. When growth is not evident, adjustments to tiered support will be made as well as considerations to the scholars education model.

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.

At Downtown Miami Charter School, we believe relationships are at the core of successfully educating scholars. We are constantly seeking new and innovative ways to build relationships with scholars, families and the community at large. We also understand that in order to successfully build relationships scholars need more than just academic work to reach their greatest potential.

To build relationships with scholars we have infused school-wide practices that help support behavior and academic success. As a Leader in Me school we participate in daily Morning Meetings and Closing Circles. This gives scholars an opportunity to enjoy a message from their teacher, share things they would like others to know about their life and form positive relationships with their peers. All of our Morning Meetings and Closing Circles are themed around the 7 Habits for Highly Effective People.

In addition, to our Morning Meetings and Closing Circles all scholars and staff participate in mediation 3 times a day using the our Calm curriculum. This gives scholars an opportunity to release excess energy or worries that they may bring to school or gain throughout the school day. By providing this opportunity to scholars they are able to refocus their minds on the work that is being presented to them.

Since, our mission is to create a generation of leaders we are an academy based school that focuses on Art, STEM and STEAM. Each scholar in our building is placed into a specific academy, with the intention to use their talents to pay it forward. Each scholar has the opportunity two showcases for their Academy each year. During these showcases we open to doors to all stakeholders and scholars have the opportunity to showcase their work for their specific academy. Academy curriculum are infused in our daily teaching and through project based learning and our special area classes.

Furthermore, we are continuously seeking ways to build a with families. Each grade level invites families into their classroom throughout the year to participate in Parent Collaborative Activities. This is an opportunity for a parent to experience what it means to learn at DMCS. We also host different events throughout the school year such as Grandparents Day, Monthly Parent Training's, Volunteer Appreciation Day, among much more to both celebrate and engage families in the scholars academic success.

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: Math				$6,800.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	3600 - Downtown Miami Charter School	General Fund		$5,000.00
			Notes: Coach Digital for additional mathematics practice for K-6 scholars.			
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	3600 - Downtown Miami Charter School	General Fund		$1,800.00
			Notes: Brain Pop			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$27,200.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		519-Technology-Related Supplies	3600 - Downtown Miami Charter School	General Fund		$1,200.00
			Notes: Reading A-Z for leveled reading instruction.			
		520-Textbooks	3600 - Downtown Miami Charter School			$26,000.00
			Notes: Fundations for K-2 scholars to support foundational skills (phonemic awareness and phonics).			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement				$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			3600 - Downtown Miami Charter School	Other		$0.00
			Notes: Owl Classroom Kits			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning				$0.00
					Total:	$34,000.00