

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Sports Leadership And Management Charter School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Sports Leadership And Management Charter School Middle School

604 NW 12 AVE, Miami, FL 33136

www.slammiami.com

## Demographics

Principal: Rey Breto

Start Date for this Principal: 4/20/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (52%)
<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>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade County School Board.

## 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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Sports Leadership And Management Charter School Middle School

604 NW 12 AVE, Miami, FL 33136

www.slammiami.com

## School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	94%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	99%

## School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	D

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

The mission of SLAM Charter Middle School is to provide an innovative and in-depth secondary educational program that produces college-bound students through emphasis on sports-related majors and post-secondary preparation.

SLAM engages students in:  
Sports-infused lessons that develop  
Lifelong learners who persistently pursue  
Academic and personal excellence and are  
Motivated to become world changers.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

SLAM's vision is to engage all students in: Sports infused lessons that develop Lifelong learners who persistently pursue Academic and personal excellence and are Motivated to become future world changers.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Breto, Rey	Principal	Head of Schools
Abascal, Mercedes	Assistant Principal	
Tellechea, Patricia	Assistant Principal	
Brown, Nicole	Math Coach	Instructional Coach and Math Department Chair
Mas, Ana	Staffing Specialist	ESE Program Specialist
De La Cruz, Barbara	School Counselor	Ensure Student's Academic and Social Emotional Needs are Met
Figueroa, Lydia	Parent Engagement Liaison	CIS
Matos, Wilmer	Dean	Dean of Academics and Discipline
Pernas, Allan	Dean	Dean of Discipline
Lozano, Claudia	Teacher, ESE	ESE Support Staff and Teacher
Casas, Jose	ELL Compliance Specialist	ESOL Specialist
Micek, Thomas	Science Coach	Science Instructional Coach
Profete, Dafine	Reading Coach	Reading Instructional Coach
Martinez, Esther	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Liaison
Huiwoud, Aime	Other	Progress Monitoring, District Student Assessment Chair, and State Assessment Coordinator
Gomez, Andrea	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Senior Lead Teacher
Timo, Cassandra	Other	Academic Advisor
McDonald, Yvonne	School Counselor	SEL Counselor

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Thursday 4/20/2017, Rey Breto

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

25

**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.*

25

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

52

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,020

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

7

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

17

**Demographic Data****Early Warning Systems****2021-22**

**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	334	318	348	0	0	0	0	1000	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	11	5	0	0	0	0	74	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	3	0	0	0	0	19	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	15	25	0	0	0	0	56	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	23	20	0	0	0	0	98	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	121	112	0	0	0	0	363	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	128	137	125	0	0	0	0	390	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	155	135	120	0	0	0	0	410	

**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	175	179	181	0	0	0	0	535	

**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	5	4	5	0	0	0	0	14	
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 8/31/2021

**2020-21 - 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	281	339	295	0	0	0	0	915	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	15	10	0	0	0	0	50	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	5	0	0	0	0	20	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on the 2018 statewide ELA Assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	83	50	0	0	0	0	208	
Level 1 on the 2018 statewide Math Assessments	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	90	80	0	0	0	0	270	

**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	180	150	120	0	0	0	0	450	

**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	8	5	3	0	0	0	0	16	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

**2020-21 - 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	281	339	295	0	0	0	0	915
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	15	10	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	5	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on the 2018 statewide ELA Assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	83	50	0	0	0	0	208
Level 1 on the 2018 statewide Math Assessments	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	90	80	0	0	0	0	270

#### 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	180	150	120	0	0	0	0	450

#### 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	8	5	3	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	6

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				48%	58%	54%	38%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	58%	54%	42%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	52%	47%	40%	52%	47%
Math Achievement				42%	58%	58%	43%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				44%	56%	57%	42%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	54%	51%	44%	55%	51%
Science Achievement				42%	52%	51%	21%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				60%	74%	72%	44%	73%	72%

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

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

<b>ELA</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2021					
	2019	44%	58%	-14%	54%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	47%	56%	-9%	52%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
08	2021					
	2019	48%	60%	-12%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2021					
	2019	28%	58%	-30%	55%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	45%	53%	-8%	54%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
08	2021					
	2019	41%	40%	1%	46%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
08	2021					
	2019	37%	43%	-6%	48%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	0%	68%	-68%	67%	-67%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	59%	73%	-14%	71%	-12%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	69%	63%	6%	61%	8%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

**Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.**

In an effort to progress monitor students for the 2020-2021 academic school year, SLAM Middle utilized variety of tools in an effort to assess academic progress and evaluate the effectiveness of instruction. For grades sixth through eighth, the iReady Diagnostic Assessments were used for English Language Arts and Mathematics. The iReady Diagnostic Assessments were administered during the Fall, Winter, and Spring. For 7th grade Civics, the school used USA Test Prep for Baselines and Mid-Year Assessments, followed by the State Standardized Civics End of Course (EOC) Exam. For Grade 8 Science, the school used the District Baseline and Mid-Year Assessments, followed by the state Standardized Grade 8 Science Comprehensive Exam. Holistic Data Results are demonstrated below.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21%	22%	20%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17%	15%	17%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31%	35%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15%	18%	26%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21%	39%	53%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26%	36%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12%	12%	23%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20%	29%	37%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

## Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	16	28	30	15	21	42			88		
ELL	25	34	37	19	22	42	23	52	82		
BLK	38	36	26	27	17	20	29	35	75		
HSP	37	39	38	25	23	39	41	57	80		
WHT	47	38		50	42						
FRL	35	37	36	24	22	36	40	52	79		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	27	44	38	34	45		30	50			
ELL	38	49	43	34	42	53	32	54	61		
BLK	48	41	46	43	35	39	25	49	65		
HSP	48	53	48	42	45	54	45	63	71		

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
WHT	47	60		27	53						
FRL	49	52	48	41	43	52	42	61	70		
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	20	36	38	24	42	50		25			
ELL	17	35	38	24	32	46	8	21			
BLK	37	42	60	44	36	29	13	68	46		
HSP	38	43	38	43	43	45	23	41	43		
FRL	37	43	39	42	43	45	21	43	43		

### ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	429
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	44
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	



## Analysis

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

According to the 2019 School Data Map and the 2020-2021 iReady Progress Monitoring Diagnostic Results, Mathematics across all grade levels seem to still reveal a need for additional academic support.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

According to the 2019 School Data Map, Mathematics received an overall 46 percent proficiency rating. Although this only demonstrates a one percent decrease from the 2017-2018 data results, our math learning gains and our lowest 25th percentile did increase. When compared to 2017-2018, our lowest 25th percentile increased by eight percent and our learning gains by two percentage points. Additionally, as aforementioned, the iReady progress monitoring data is impactful because it reveals a need for additional support within the Mathematics Department.

#### What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

According to the 2019 School Data Map, our 6th Grade students achieved an overall 28 percent proficiency rating on the FSA, Mathematics; resulting in a six percentage point decrease compared to 2017-2018. The School Data Map also demonstrated a drop within the English Language Learners (ELL) over the course of the last two years. In 2017, ELL's overall math proficiency decreased by 2 percentage points. This data is impactful because it reveals a need for additional support for ELL students in math literacy.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Grade 8 Science has revealed the area of most improved based on the 2019 Data Map and the 2020-2021 Progress Monitoring Tool Results. According to the 2018-2019 School Data Map, Grade 8 science proficiency increased by twenty-one percentage points and continued to increase in an upward trend during the 2020-2021 progress monitoring assessment results.

#### What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

These data findings are significantly impactful because they prove that the support collaboration model utilized in the science classes have proven to be effective.

#### What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

The Grade 8 Science Department and the school leadership team will continue to focus on the school's implementation of comprehensive assessments and using data to create an effective learning environment. Data and progress monitoring will continue to drive the instructional planning, re-teaching, and differentiating instruction within each of the science classes.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

In addition, we will continue to hold Professional Learning Communities (PLC) as a reflective piece on how to use data to drive and improve instruction. Through this initiative, we will create more data savvy teachers who can plan more effectively and can reach all learners.

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

Additional professional development opportunities will be provided in an effort to plan for differentiated instruction and analyze student work for progress towards mastery. Teachers will continue to participate in Mentoring Programs, Instructional Coaching Cycles, and various opportunities will be provided to witness exemplary GRRM Lessons. Department and Faculty Meetings will continue to shift into mini-professional learning opportunities and data-chat conferences. Professional Learning Goals and PLCs will be driven by student learning outcomes.

### **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

#### **Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>The School's Leadership Team (SLT) is committed to working alongside of its instructional coaches, teachers, and all stakeholders in an joint effort to improve positive student outcomes.</p> <p>If rigor, relevance, relationships, and the framework of Differentiated Instruction (D.I) is infused across all content areas during Instruction, then student achievement will increase.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	<p>In an effort to promote positive student outcomes for ELL students in Math literacy, the SLT will engage in the continuous progress monitoring by conducting bi-weekly data chats. In the effort to increase Math learning gains, the SLT will monitor instructional practices and pacing in the core and intensive math classes, as well engage the team in ongoing data discussions. Additionally, the school's leadership team will set short and long-term goals for the lowest 25% within ELA and Math cores and actively track the group's progress. As the School Improvement Plan unfolds, the team will modify/ refine its action steps as needed to ensure academic success for the lowest 25%. through the use of differentiated instruction, the team will work to ensure that teachers emerge in reflective data discussions routinely and that they provide instructional feedback, following walk-throughs, biweekly and monthly throughout the school year.</p>
<b>Monitoring:</b>	<p>The School's Leadership Team (SLT) is committed to working alongside of its instructional coaches, teachers, and all stakeholders in an joint effort to improve positive student outcomes. The administrative team currently meets with teachers and department leaders both formally and informally, biweekly, to discuss emergent and summative data, address and modify instructional concerns, and acknowledge areas of growth. Additionally, the School Leadership Team works to develop others by allotting time during faculty meetings for the sharing of instructional strategies and best practices.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Rey Breto (rbreto@slammiami.com)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>The SLT team strives to empower teachers by fostering a culture of shared-best practices. The team further provides teachers with guidance on how to use emergent data to guide targeted differentiated instruction and provides feedback on instructional delivery following daily and weekly walkthroughs. It works toward the development of the School Improvement Process and its implementation steps every quarter.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>The SLT will work toward the development of the School Improvement Process and its implementation steps every quarter. Professional learning at the school site is not only purposeful, but developed based on staff needs.</p> <p>The team further strives to extend leadership opportunities to all interested staff. In an effort to sustain the growth of technology integration, the SLT will continue to promote standards-based and student-centered learning through technology integration. Lastly, the SLT's shared outcome for the 2021-2022 is to build capacity among all teachers and students through the use of Differentiated Instruction (DI) and Creating Independence through Student centered activities. It is through these methods that students will receive more personalized approach to learning; resulting in higher student success and achievement.</p>

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**The school reported 1.4 incidents per 100 students which is less than the state middle school rate of 4.7 incidents per 100 students.**

#### **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.**

SLAM Middle School strives to provide all students with the opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps. SLAM's Student Services Department develops a yearly Curriculum Bulletin that provides students as well as parents with the courses offered along with a brief description of each course. The Curriculum Bulletin indicates several options for academies and tracks for students to choose from. School counselors conduct presentations to all students by class and grade levels and assist students in the selection of courses by completing the Subject Selection Form. In addition, counselors review school individual course plans to assure that students are enrolled in courses that align with the students' future career goals. SLAM's CAP Advisor further enhances student awareness of careers and college options through the use of the school website, regular meetings and classroom visits. Parent academies, student orientations, community involvement sessions and student peers help with the process of team building within the school.

#### **Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.**

Constant communication between the stakeholders is essential to the success of the student. Collaborated events between the school and home are established to support parental engagement with the school. These events include but are not limited to: EESAC meetings, Student and Parent Orientation Meetings, Zoom Town Hall Virtual Meetings, Back to School Night, Parent/Teacher Conferences, and Student Parent Association

(SPA) meetings. Additionally, SLAM Middle School implements a school-wide life skills program designed as an "Advisory Period" to enhance the overall human performance in and out of school grounds. Topics discussed correlate with relevant concepts pertaining to each of the student's grade level and academic expectations. Such topics include but are not limited to

study skills, interpersonal conflict, goal-setting, social emotional learning, overcoming setbacks, building confidence, problem solving tactics, life skills for school and beyond, game plans for college, and post-secondary success awareness.

## 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: Professional Learning Communities</b>				<b>\$432,759.80</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	6015 - Slam Charter Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$45,726.00
			<i>Notes: Curriculum Support Specialist, Instructional Support</i>			
	2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	6015 - Slam Charter Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$44,078.00
			<i>Notes: Math Instructional Coach</i>			
	2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	6015 - Slam Charter Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$47,500.00
			<i>Notes: Reading Instructional Coach</i>			
	2110	160-Other Support Personnel	6015 - Slam Charter Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$170,240.00
			<i>Notes: Interventionist - Instructional Support - Tier 2 &amp; 3</i>			
	2110	160-Other Support Personnel	6015 - Slam Charter Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$109,215.80
			<i>Notes: Targeted Tutoring</i>			
	2110	160-Other Support Personnel	6015 - Slam Charter Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$16,000.00
			<i>Notes: Community Involvement Specialist</i>			
<b>Total:</b>						<b>\$432,759.80</b>