Miami Community Charter Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Miami Community Charter Middle School

18720 SW 352ND ST, Florida City, FL 33034

www.mccedu.org

Demographics

Principal: Stephany Papili

Start Date for this Principal: 9/14/2020

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)	92%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (38%)
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

Miami Community Charter Middle School

18720 SW 352ND ST, Florida City, FL 33034

www.mccedu.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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	98%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	100%

School Grades History

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

At MCCS (Miami Community Charter School), our faculty is committed to empowering our students through mentorship to be held accountable by teaching them to embrace responsibility, demonstrate mutual respect, and engage in open communication. Our continuous collaboration of all stakeholders will provide a safe and nurturing environment which promotes students' social-emotional and academic growth. Students will feel secure in embracing new challenges by identifying their individual strengths, motivating them through goals, and celebrating their victories. Through our endeavors and dedication to community service, our students will achieve their full potential and become productive members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As life long learners, MCCS students will take ownership to transform obstacles into opportunities for a better community.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Papili, Stephany	Principal	
Rieumont, Mildrelis	Assistant Principal	
Mejia, Raquel	Teacher, ESE	
Mitchell, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Rezaie, Jila	Other	
Rezaie, Jila	Assistant Principal	
Qureshi, Wajida	Teacher, K-12	
Saavedra, Ruben	Instructional Technology	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 9/14/2020, Stephany Papili

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)	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)	92%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (38%)
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	97	104	113	0	0	0	0	314
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	25	33	0	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	29	29	0	0	0	0	82
	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	26	39	49	0	0	0	0	114

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

Monday 9/14/2020

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	98	112	97	0	0	0	0	307
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	5
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	32	32	0	0	0	0	93

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	37	58	44	0	0	0	0	139

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	98	112	97	0	0	0	0	307
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	5
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	32	32	0	0	0	0	93

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	37	58	44	0	0	0	0	139

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	

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	42%	58%	54%	34%	53%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	58%	54%	43%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	47%	35%	48%	44%
Math Achievement	42%	58%	58%	39%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	61%	56%	57%	48%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	54%	51%	44%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	29%	52%	51%	40%	50%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	64%	74%	72%	56%	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	41%	58%	-17%	54%	-13%
	2018	41%	53%	-12%	52%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	39%	56%	-17%	52%	-13%
	2018	28%	54%	-26%	51%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	41%	60%	-19%	56%	-15%
	2018	44%	59%	-15%	58%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	34%	58%	-24%	55%	-21%
	2018	46%	56%	-10%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	28%	53%	-25%	54%	-26%
	2018	18%	52%	-34%	54%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
08	2019	31%	40%	-9%	46%	-15%
	2018	14%	38%	-24%	45%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	2%	43%	-41%	48%	-46%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	40%	44%	-4%	50%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-38%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	68%	-4%	67%	-3%
2018	41%	65%	-24%	65%	-24%
Compare		23%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	73%	-12%	71%	-10%
2018	49%	72%	-23%	71%	-22%
Compare		12%			

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	75%	63%	12%	61%	14%
2018	30%	59%	-29%	62%	-32%
Compare		45%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	68%	54%	14%	57%	11%
2018	82%	54%	28%	56%	26%
Compare		-14%			

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	20			20							

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
ELL	23	50	49	32	55	58	6	50	52		
BLK	52	63		24	67				64		
HSP	40	55	51	44	61	62	29	67	75		
FRL	42	55	50	41	61	64	30	64	75		

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
ELL	15	46	39	20	45	42	16	32	24		
BLK	36	38		20	29			55	38		
HSP	38	51	48	35	47	54	41	50	38		
FRL	38	49	44	33	46	52	42	52	39		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
ELL	14	34	35	23	41	52	28	30	36		
BLK	29	48		30	50						
HSP	34	41	36	40	47	41	38	53	54		
FRL	35	44	35	39	48	45	40	56	54		

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	52
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	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	521
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
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	54
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	52
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	52
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 showing the lowest performance is Science Achievement at 29% proficiency. The contributing factors to this is the limited language proficiency and tier 3 content vocabulary inquisition.

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

The data component demonstrating the greatest decline from the prior year is the Science Achievement from 41 to 29. The contributing factor is the limited english acquisition and vocabulary.

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 demonstrating the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Science at a 22 % points difference. The contributing factor is the number of english language learners, due to their limited english proficiency and vocabulary acquisition.

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

The data demonstrating the most improvement is in the area of Math Lowest 25% Gains from 48% to 64%. The school reorganized the teachers assignments, provided intensified instruction, tutoring, and implementation of instructional programs.

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

Two potential areas of concerns reflecting on the EWS Data are Previous Year FSA Level 1 and 2 Score in Lang Arts (English) and Math.

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

1. Science Achievement
2.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If instruction is increased In ELA/Reading, then students' achievement will improve. The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps to ensure higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment. Teachers follow standards based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted.
Measurable Outcome:	Student achievement in English Language Arts will increase by 5 percentage points to 47%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephany Papili (spapili7@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Universal Design, Marzano's Taxonomy, and Webb's Depth of Knowledge will continue to be implemented in order to increase the level of rigor in instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps to ensure higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment. Teachers follow standards based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted. Marzano's Taxonomy and Webb's Depth of Knowledge are both scales of cognitive demands to align standards with assessments

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will be provided with professional development opportunities pertaining to : Rigor, Unpacking the Standards-ELA, and I-Ready Data Driven Instruction.
2. Implementation on IReady online instruction.
3. Ellevation in Class for ELL instruction as well as ELL PD.
4. Ongoing progress monitoring, every 20 days.
5. Biweekly assessments using iReady Standards Mastery.
6. Implementaiton of Flocabulary for Vocabulary enrichment.

Person Responsible	Stephany Papili (spapili7@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If instruction is increased in Mathematics, then students' achievement will improve. Aligning learning to standards helps ensure a higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment, if teachers follow a standard based instructional model to ensure that their students meet the demands of the learning target.
Measurable Outcome:	Student achievement in 6th Grade General Mathematics will increase by 5 percentage points to 39%. Student achievement in 7th Grade General Mathematics will increase by 5 percentage points to 33%. Student achievement in 8th Grade General Mathematics will increase by 5 percentage points to 36%. Student achievement in Algebra 1 will increase by 5 percentage points to 80%. Student achievement in Geometry will increase by 5 percentage points to 73%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephany Papili (spapili7@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Universal Design, Marzano's Taxonomy, and Webb's Depth of Knowledge will continue to be implemented in order to increase the level of rigor in instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps to ensure higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment. Teachers follow standards based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted. Marzano's Taxonomy and Webb's Depth of Knowledge are both scales of cognitive demands to align standards with assessments

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will be provided with professional development opportunities pertaining to: iCads Rigor, and IReady Data Driven Instruction (Progress Monitoring)(Pre-Algebra & Algebra 1 Progress Monitoring) ELLevation in Class (ELL)
2. Implementation of HRW (Geometry& Alg. 1 Progress Monitoring), iReady Online Instruction (General Math), and Khan Academy (supplement).
3. Data Driven Progress Monitoring measured by iReady Standard Mastery (Gen. Math), Topic Assessments (Geom. & Alg.1).

Person Responsible	Stephany Papili (spapili7@dadeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If instruction is increased in Civics, the students' achievement will improve. Aligning learning to standards helps ensure a higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment, if teachers follow a standard based instructional model to ensure that their students meet the demands of the learning target.
Measurable Outcome:	Student achievement in Social Studies (Civics) will increase by 5 percentage points to 66%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephany Papili (spapili7@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Universal Design, Marzano's Taxonomy, and Webb's Depth of Knowledge will continue to be implemented in order to increase the level of rigor in instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps to ensure higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment. Teachers follow standards based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted. Marzano's Taxonomy and Webb's Depth of Knowledge are both scales of cognitive demands to align standards with assessments

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will be provided with professional development opportunities pertaining to: Rigor Unpacking the Standards, ELLevation in the Classroom and iCads
2. Implementation of CPalms tutorials and Khan Academy.
3. Implementation of District Based Topic Assessment for ongoing progress monitoring.
4. Data Driven Assessment measured by Topic Assessments.

Person Responsible Stephany Papili (spapili7@dadeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If instruction is increased in Science, the students' achievement will improve. Aligning learning to standards helps ensure a higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment, if teachers follow a standard based instructional model to ensure that their students meet the demands of the learning target.
Measurable Outcome:	Student achievement in Science (8th Grade Comprehensive Science) will increase by 5 percentage points to 7%. Student achievement in Science (Biology) will increase by 5 percentage points to 69%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephany Papili (spapili7@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Universal Design, Marzano's Taxonomy, and Webb's Depth of Knowledge will continue to be implemented in order to increase the level of rigor in instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps to ensure higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment. Teachers follow standards based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted. Marzano's Taxonomy and Webb's Depth of Knowledge are both scales of cognitive demands to align standards with assessments

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will be provided with professional development opportunities pertaining to: Rigor Unpacking the Standards, iCads, and ELLevation in the Class.
2. Implementation of Gizmos, IXL (General Comprehensive Science), and Edgenuity (Biology).
3. Implementation of CIS (comprehension instructional sequence) CER (claim evidence reason).
4. Data Driven Instruction measured by Topic Assessment for ongoing progress monitoring.

Person Responsible	Stephany Papili (spapili7@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school academic leadership team meets periodically including weekly PLCs to review and analyze ongoing data towards data driven lesson planning, differentiated instruction, and best practices.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

To ensure that the students social-emotional needs are being met, the school employs a Dean of Students and a guidance counselor to address the counseling, mentoring, and any other guidance services that the student's may need.
Principal – Stephany Papili
Assistant Principal - Federal and State Compliance - Jacqueline Sera-Sirven Assistant Principal & Instructional Leader-Social Studies-Mildrelis Rieumont Instructional Leader Mathematics-Mildrelis Rieumont Exception Student Education (ESE) Instructional Leader –Raquel Mejia English Language Learner (ELL) Instructional Leader-Mrs Auster Instructional Leader ELA/Reading- Rommy Saavedra
Instructional Leader-World Language-Lianet Rodriguez
Instructional Leader-Digital Learning-Ruben Saavedra
Instructional Leader-Science-Wajida Qureshi
Technology Specialist – Marcos Padron
School Psychologist – Brenda Johnson
Speech Language Pathologist – Ms. McCalla
Guidance Counselor (Mental Health)– Abinel Marquez
Dean of Students – Novelette Lindsay
Jila Rezaie - Executive Director
Guidance Counselor (Mental Health):
The guidance counselor supports learning through the provision of discussion forums around such key issues as effective program design, through effective assessment strategies and interpersonal relations for our students. The guidance counselor leads many student support services meetings and facilitates the productive outcome that enhances the learning environment for many of our students. The guidance counselor impacts both the affective and effective domains of learning school wide.
Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.
Last Modified: 9/18/2019 https://www.floridacims.org Page 17 of 20
Dade - 6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School - 2019-20 SIP
Dean of Students:
The Dean of Students will provide interventions; continue to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.
Describe the strategies the school em

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: ELA				$106,234.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7730	100-Salaries	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	Title, I Part A		$47,947.00
			Notes: ELA Teacher Salary			
	7730	100-Salaries	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	Title, I Part A		$48,787.00
			Notes: ELA Teacher Salary			
	6500	519-Technology-Related Supplies	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	Title, I Part A		$8,000.00
			Notes: I-Ready Reading and Mathematics Ongoing Progress Monitoring Online Program			
	3376	310-Professional and Technical Services	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	General Fund		$1,500.00
			Notes: I-Ready Reading and Mathematics Professional Development.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$69,494.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7730	100-Salaries	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	Title, I Part A		$46,058.00
			Notes: Math Teacher Salary.			
	7730	100-Salaries	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	Title, I Part A		$23,436.00
			Notes: Math Paraprofessional.			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies				$37,269.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7730	100-Salaries	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	General Fund		$37,269.00
			Notes: SS Teacher Salary.			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				$50,085.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6500	519-Technology-Related Supplies	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	General Fund		$4,725.00
			Notes: IXL and Edgenuity Ongoing Progress Monitoring Online Program.			
	7730	100-Salaries	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	General Fund		$45,360.00
			Notes: Science Teacher Salary.			

	Total:	$263,082.00