

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Miami Community Charter High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

# Miami Community Charter High School

18720 SW 352ND ST, Florida City, FL 33034

www.mccedu.org

## Demographics

Principal: Stephany Papili

Start Date for this Principal: 9/14/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: C (42%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Miami Community Charter High School

18720 SW 352ND ST, Florida City, FL 33034

[www.mccedu.org](http://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)
High School 9-12	Yes	100%
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	D

## 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	
Marquez, Abinel	School Counselor	
Rieumont, Mildrelis	Assistant Principal	
Marquez, Abinel	Teacher, K-12	
Rodriguez, Lianet	Teacher, K-12	
Saavedra, Ruben	Teacher, K-12	
Lindsay, Novelette	Dean	
Qureshi, Wajida	Teacher, K-12	
Johnson, Brenda	Assistant Principal	
Mejia, Raquel	Teacher, ESE	

### 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**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: C (42%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**Early Warning Systems****Current Year**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	76	56	49	244
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	22	22	9	80
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	20	18	9	74

**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	35	0	4	21	60

**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**

Tuesday 9/15/2020

**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	83	57	48	41	229	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	12	
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	8	3	0	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	21	18	10	70	

**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	37	3	20	14	74

**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	83	57	48	41	229
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	12
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	8	3	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	21	18	10	70

**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	37	3	20	14	74

**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	44%	59%	56%	27%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	54%	51%	35%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	48%	42%	37%	45%	41%
Math Achievement	49%	54%	51%	17%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	71%	52%	48%	33%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%	51%	45%	57%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	59%	68%	68%	0%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	55%	76%	73%	53%	71%	70%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

**NOTE:** This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	38%	55%	-17%	55%	-17%
	2018	32%	54%	-22%	53%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	44%	53%	-9%	53%	-9%
	2018	25%	54%	-29%	53%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

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

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	52%	68%	-16%	67%	-15%
2018	33%	65%	-32%	65%	-32%
Compare		19%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	52%	71%	-19%	70%	-18%
2018	53%	67%	-14%	68%	-15%
Compare		-1%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	38%	63%	-25%	61%	-23%
2018	20%	59%	-39%	62%	-42%
Compare		18%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	54%	-6%	57%	-9%
2018	24%	54%	-30%	56%	-32%
Compare		24%			

## 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
ELL	33	55	50	41	69	73		22		82	71
HSP	44	54	54	51	73	75	53	53		90	54
FRL	45	57	54	49	71	75	59	59		92	56
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	3	51	61	12	20	20		38		55	
HSP	31	51	61	23	35	35	42	56		80	53
FRL	30	50	57	22	35	39	46	56		89	47
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	5	24	30	10	45	77		31		58	
HSP	25	35	35	15	32	59		50		88	9
FRL	27	36	43	17	33	60		53		85	9

## ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	665
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61

Hispanic Students	
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	62
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 ELA Proficiency at 44% proficiency. The contributing factors to this is the limited language proficiency and tier 3 vocabulary acquisition.

**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 ELA Low 25 from 59 to 50. The contributing factor is the number of english language learners, due to their limited english proficiency.

**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 Social Studies at a 18 % points difference. The contributing factor is the number of english language learners, due to their limited english proficiency and tier 3 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 Learning Gains from 35% to 71%. 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 Previous Year Algebra 1.

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

1. ELA Low 25
2. ELA Proficiency

### 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 49%

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Stephany Papili (spapili@mccsedu.org)

**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 rigorous teaching and learning.
2. Implement Achieve 3000 for ongoing progress monitoring in Reading.
3. Ellevation and Imagine Learning in Class for ELL instruction.
4. Ongoing progress monitoring, every 20 days.

**Person Responsible** Stephany Papili (spapili@mccsedu.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus** If instruction is increased in Mathematics (Algebra 1 and Geometry) , then students' achievement will improve.

**Description and Rationale:** 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 Mathematics (Algebra 1 and Geometry) will increase by 5 percentage points to 54%.  
Algebra 1 will increase by 5 percentage points to 43% and Geometry will increase 5 percentage points to 53%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Stephany Papili (spapili@mccsedu.org)

**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. Ongoing Progress Monitoring for Algebra 1 and Geometry Topic Assessments
2. Implement HRW for Ongoing Progress Monitoring in Geometry
3. Implement Khan Academy for addition differentiated instruction support. Topic Assessments

**Person Responsible** Stephany Papili (spapili@mccsedu.org)



**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** If instruction is increased in Science (Biology), 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 Science (Biology) will increase by 5 percentage points to 64%

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Stephany Papili (spapili@mccsedu.org)

**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, ICADS, ELlevation, Gizmos, CIS (comprehension instructional sequence ), CER (claim evidence reason.)
2. Implementation of Edgenuity for ongoing progress monitoring.
3. Implementation of District based monthly assessments for Data Driven Instruction.

**Person Responsible** Stephany Papili (spapili@mccsedu.org)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	If instruction is increased in Social Studies (U.S.History), 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.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Student achievement in Social Studies (U.S. History) will increase by 5 percentage points to 60%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Stephany Papili (spapili@mccsedu.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	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.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	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, and ELLevation.
2. Implementation of Topic Assessments, and Unit Tests for ongoing progress monitoring.

**Person Responsible** Stephany Papili (spapili@mccsedu.org)

**#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** If graduation rates increase, then students exhibiting two or more early warning indicators will decrease. Aligning graduation requirements to ensure a higher level of graduation rate and college acceptance.

**Measurable Outcome:** Graduation rate will sustain at 90%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Stephany Papili (spapili@mccsedu.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. One on one meetings with guidance counselor minimum once per quarter to review credit history. 2. Parent meetings to review credit history and graduation requirements .
3. Ongoing class grades monitoring and guidance.
4. College and Career Fair for College Applications and requirements .
5. FAFSA Parents Night to guide and assistance through financial aid process.

**Person Responsible** Stephany Papili (spapili@mccsedu.org)

**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 (ALT) meets periodically including weekly PLCs with the department teams to review and analyze data driven instruction towards effective differentiated instruction/lesson planning 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.

Principal:

Principal facilitates the implementation of a common vision at our school. This includes the use of data based decision-making, ensuring that the school-based team is implementing MTSS

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 16 of 21

Dade - 7058 - Miami Community Charter High School - 2019-20 SIP

appropriately in consideration of the diverse needs of our student population, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff with appropriate recommendations for professional development as necessary, ensures implementation of interventions as support tools, and communicates with parents school-based decision-making and the development of plans affecting our community of students.

Administration (Vice Principal):

Administration team ensures the fidelity of the RtI implementation through a process of problem solving as issues and concerns arise through an ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well-being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention.

Select General Education Teachers:

Our general education staff provides information about core instruction, encourage active participation, and monitor the process during both the collection of student data and subsequent disaggregation sessions. Additionally they play a major part in the delivery of interventions to our Tier 1 population. Working in collaboration with support staff and administration, our teachers design, develop, and deliver Tier 2 interventions. Teacher led tutorials integrate Tier 1 materials and teaching in addition to Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction with accompanying lessons and activities tailors these sessions in ways that meet and complement our diverse population of students and their needs.

Instructional Leaders

Instructional leaders will implement, lead, and evaluate school core content programs. They will identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They will identify systematic patterns of student needs and identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies.

### **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.

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>				<b>\$131,729.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7730	100-Salaries	7058 - Miami Community Charter High School	Title, I Part A		\$45,263.00
	3336	519-Technology-Related Supplies	7058 - Miami Community Charter High School	General Fund		\$16,115.00
<i>Notes: Achieve 3000 ELA/Reading Ongoing Progress Monitoring Online Program.</i>						
	7730	100-Salaries	7058 - Miami Community Charter High School	Title, I Part A		\$17,186.00
<i>Notes: Paraprofessional.</i>						
	7730	100-Salaries	7058 - Miami Community Charter High School	Title, I Part A		\$53,165.00
<i>Notes: ESE Teacher.</i>						
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>				<b>\$54,203.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7730	100-Salaries	7058 - Miami Community Charter High School	General Fund		\$51,158.00
<i>Notes: Math Teacher Salary</i>						
	3336	529-Technology-Related Textbooks	7058 - Miami Community Charter High School	General Fund		\$3,045.00
<i>Notes: Alg.1 &amp; Geometry HRW.</i>						
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science</b>				<b>\$5,850.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3336	519-Technology-Related Supplies	7058 - Miami Community Charter High School	General Fund		\$5,850.00
<i>Notes: Edgenuity Ongoing Progress Monitoring Online Program</i>						
<b>4</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies</b>				<b>\$45,500.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7730	100-Salaries	7058 - Miami Community Charter High School	General Fund		\$45,500.00
<i>Notes: SS Teacher.</i>						
<b>5</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation</b>				<b>\$61,800.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7730	100-Salaries	7058 - Miami Community Charter High School	General Fund		\$61,800.00
<i>Notes: Guidance Counselor Salary.</i>						
<b>Total:</b>						<b>\$299,082.00</b>