

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Miami Arts Charter School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Miami Arts Charter School

95 NW 23RD ST, Miami, FL 33127

www.miamiartscharter.net

Demographics

Principal: Alfredo De La Rosa

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2009

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	2%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (60%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Miami Arts Charter School

95 NW 23RD ST, Miami, FL 33127

www.miamiartscharter.net

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 6-12	No	11%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	79%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Miami Arts Charter School will provide a rigorous academic education that considers the fine arts a core educational priority. Our goal is to awaken students' minds and hearts through an expectation of high competence from all, providing instruction clearly related to the world and developing autonomy skills leading to an elevated sense of student ownership for learning.

Through an intensive immersion in the advanced core subjects as well as the fine arts, students will develop a sense of connection to one another and the world. Specializing in instruction in music, dance, visual art, drama and creative writing, Miami Arts Charter School will provide students with opportunities to achieve excellence through meaningful academic work and inspiring performance experiences that will propel their artistic creativity exciting them about life itself.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision for the future is to be the best choice for highly artistic students to receive an innovative and challenging rigorous liberal arts education. We will provide an inspiring growth environment sparking curiosity in all students as they develop intellectually, creatively and artistically toward the achievement of career goals and becoming life-long learners.

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
Delarosa, Alfredo	Principal	Develop and evaluate policies and procedures Responsible for Safety Instructional Leader Curriculum Development Day-to-Day Operations District and State Compliance Personnel Facilities Management Stakeholder Communications
Delarosa, Christine	Assistant Principal	Follow policies and procedures Curriculum Development Responsible for Safety Instructional Leader Day-to-Day Operations Teacher Training and Professional Development Personnel Teacher Observations Stakeholder Communications
Torres, Carolina	Assistant Principal	Follow policies and procedures Curriculum Development Responsible for Safety Instructional Leader Day-to-Day Operations Teacher Observations AP Coordinator School Assessment Coordinator Academic Advisor Master Schedule Student Services
Diaz, Aramis	Assistant Principal	Follow policies and procedures Responsible for Safety Security Manager Maintenance Manager Dean of Discipline Instructional Leader Day-to-Day Operations Healthy and Safety Compliance Building Supervisor
Barreiro, Valerie	Assistant Principal	Follow policies and procedures Responsible for Safety Instructional Leader Day-to-Day Operations Arts Curriculum Development Art Teacher Observations

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Stakeholder Communications Admissions Auditions Coordinator EESAC Chairperson
Chaffardet, Michelle	School Counselor	Follow policies and procedures Responsible for Safety Day-to-Day Operations Student Safety Mental Health Coordinator Student Services Academic Guidance Master Schedule
Solorzano, Oscar	Teacher, ESE	IEP Development & Monitoring Special Education Monitoring 504 Coordinator ELL Coordinator Special Education Collaboration & Consultation SSD Coordinator
Valdes, Annabelle	Teacher, ESE	IEP Development & monitoring Special Education Monitoring 504 Coordinator Gifted Coordinator Special Education Collaboration & Consultation
Johnson-Bethel, Lolita	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chairperson Classroom Teacher Mentor Teacher
Rosales, Luis	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Chairperson Classroom Teacher Mentor Teacher
Martinez, Oslia	Teacher, K-12	Mathematics Department Chairperson Classroom Teacher Mentor Teacher
leon, silvio	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chairperson Classroom Teacher Mentor Teacher

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Esperon, Bryan	Teacher, K-12	CAP Advisor Classroom Teacher Mentor Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/10/2009, Alfredo De La Rosa

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

57

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	2%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (57%)

	2015-16: B (60%)
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	140	220	206	171	121	132	139	1129
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	11	5	7	13	49
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	1	0	0	0	7	1	6	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	7	1	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	50	49	41	0	0	20	183
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	53	72	43	1	30	37	258

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	11	33	35	23	2	1	10	115

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/10/2020

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

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

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	71%	59%	56%	67%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	54%	51%	55%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	48%	42%	43%	45%	41%
Math Achievement	63%	54%	51%	60%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	47%	52%	48%	50%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	51%	45%	40%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	63%	68%	68%	61%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	88%	76%	73%	85%	71%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(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
06	2019	70%	58%	12%	54%	16%
	2018	74%	53%	21%	52%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	73%	56%	17%	52%	21%
	2018	64%	54%	10%	51%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	71%	60%	11%	56%	15%
	2018	65%	59%	6%	58%	7%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
09	2019	73%	55%	18%	55%	18%
	2018	70%	54%	16%	53%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
10	2019	63%	53%	10%	53%	10%
	2018	75%	54%	21%	53%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	47%	58%	-11%	55%	-8%
	2018	78%	56%	22%	52%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-31%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	60%	53%	7%	54%	6%
	2018	68%	52%	16%	54%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
08	2019	68%	40%	28%	46%	22%
	2018	80%	38%	42%	45%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	55%	43%	12%	48%	7%
	2018	57%	44%	13%	50%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	68%	5%	67%	6%
2018	77%	65%	12%	65%	12%
Compare		-4%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	87%	73%	14%	71%	16%
2018	78%	72%	6%	71%	7%
Compare		9%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	89%	71%	18%	70%	19%
2018	96%	67%	29%	68%	28%
Compare		-7%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	69%	63%	6%	61%	8%
2018	62%	59%	3%	62%	0%
Compare		7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	70%	54%	16%	57%	13%
2018	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%
Compare		4%			

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	50	51	48	36	41	43	39	67			
ELL	54	56	49	48	42	41	46	73	33	100	42
BLK	69	58	52	55	46	40	46	89	43	96	29
HSP	69	57	51	61	46	41	62	84	44	98	59
MUL	50	40		38	33						
WHT	80	64	44	80	56	43	72	96	51	100	44
FRL	46	21		42	33					100	43
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	45	66	58	28	60	61	38	88			
ELL	46	53	42	56	64	57	55	60			
BLK	59	56	47	65	70	59	55	83	44	90	44
HSP	68	60	53	69	65	60	63	82	36	95	45
MUL	68	68		84	76		60				

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
WHT	81	69	56	81	71	72	77	91	65	95	47
FRL	64	48	59	68	47	36	63	86		100	37
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	35	41	35	37	37	26	44	74			
ELL	37	44	38	40	47	38	34	68			
BLK	63	51	35	51	44	42	44	93	50	88	47
HSP	64	54	44	58	49	38	59	82	29	98	37
MUL	63	58		65	45						
WHT	79	64	53	70	56	53	74	91	42	90	61
FRL	73	76		44	56	58				89	32

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	63
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	82
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	757
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	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	57
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	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	66
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	48
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.

Our data reveals a drop in Math Proficiency. After analyzing our school wide data, we determined that we need to increase the rigor on our math assessments as this was one of the contributing factors to the decline in performance. We will now add i-Ready standard mastery assessments to assess students in middle school. We will continue to use IXL and Prep-works for high school. The school has added a math interventionist position to support students as well as teachers in the classrooms.

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

Our data indicates that our 6th grade math showed a 31% decline from the prior year. After desegregating the data with members of the schools' leadership team as well as teachers, we determined several factors that contributed to this decline with one being the lack of progress monitoring and feedback for students.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 6th grade Mathematics. Miami Arts Charter 6th grade students scored -8% on the 2019 Math FSA as compared to the State. In order to significantly reduce this gap, the school will invest in the iReady program as well as IXL. In addition, the has hired a math interventionist to assist in providing support to students and teachers.

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 is the 7th grade ELA with a 9% increase in percentage score. This improvement was mainly due to teacher quality improvement and rigor.

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

After reflecting on the EWS data from Part 1, we determined that truancy, students with 15 or more absences is one of the areas for concern. Another area of concern is the percentage of students scoring at a Level 1 in both mathematics and ELA.

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

1. Increasing math proficiency, learning gains and lowest 25%
2. Improve the attendance rate of students
3. Increasing ELA proficiency, learning gains and lowest 25%
4. Mental Health Training
5. Advance Academic Focus

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	An Area of Focus for the 2020-21 school year is the overall Math performance in all grade levels, with an extra emphasis on closing the gap and exceeding the State scores on the 6th grade State exams. This will increase student achievement, and improve the overall academic proficiency of our students, as well as lead to more success in the high school Mathematics courses. Understanding the difficulties of our student population in Mathematics, comparatively, focusing on this area will provide support for our students and create long term benefits for student success.
---	---

Measurable Outcome: For the 2019-2020 school year the goal is to have at least 75% of students in 6th grade mathematics achieve mastery.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carolina Torres (ctorres@miamiartscharter.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: IReady program, IXL, Prepworks, and Interventions

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Providing students with the most effective programs that provide instant feedback is important, and allows students to practice concepts that are covered in class. This extra layer also provides data for the teachers, allowing them to tailor lessons to the needs of the students, and refine their instruction methods with constant data. In addition, the data provides the interventionist necessary information to create lessons to support instruction and target areas of weakness.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1-Acquire programs
- 2-Training for programs
- 3-Data conferences based on assessments
- 4-Intervention and Data assessments

Person Responsible Carolina Torres (ctorres@miamiartscharter.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

In addition to our Schoolwide Area of Focus in Mathematics, two schoolwide improvement priorities Include:

1- A focus on social-emotional education and mental health wellness. This will be addressed by:

- Mental Health Training
- Socio-emotional workshops for students
- Positive Reinforcement and safe spaces for students
- Guest speakers

2- A focus on Advanced Academics. This will be addressed by:

- Advanced Academic Academy Development and recruitment
- Increase in Advance opportunities and Courses
- Increase in Dual Enrollment participants.
- College Tours

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.

The school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders through a variety of outreach and informational sessions. Regular parent meetings with the Principal and other members of the staff to discuss our vision, policies and progress. This will also allow for parents to ask questions and receive important information. Our Message System, School Website, Newsletter, REMIND and Social Media platforms provide timely information and announcements to all stakeholders and also celebrate and share the successes and activities of the school. School will also facilitate regular parent conferences through zoom or in person to discuss individual student progress or concerns.

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				\$20,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	9800	690-Computer Software	7059 - Miami Arts Charter School	General Fund		\$20,000.00
			<i>Notes: iReady Program</i>			
Total:						\$20,000.00