
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Sports Leadership Arts Management Charter High School

604 NW 12 AVE, Miami, FL 33136

www.slammiami.com

Demographics

Principal: Rey Breto

Start Date for this Principal: 4/20/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	73%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (58%)
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	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Sports Leadership Arts Management Charter High 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)
High School 9-12	Yes	91%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	98%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

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 Academy High 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 will 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
Abascal, Mercedes	Assistant Principal	
Tellechea, Patricia	Assistant Principal	
Breto, Rey	Principal	
Besant, Janna	Reading Coach	
SanMartin, Iliana	Math Coach	
Weihl, AShley	Teacher, K-12	
Frawley, Jeff	Graduation Coach	
Figueroa, Lydia	Parent Engagement Liaison	
Mas, Ana	Teacher, ESE	
Corrales, Roseanne	Teacher, ESE	
Casas, Jose	ELL Compliance Specialist	
Matos, Wilmer	Dean	
Gomez, Andrea	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Padron, Dayami	Teacher, K-12	

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.*

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

Total number of students enrolled at the school

866

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

10

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

15

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	0	0	0	277	278	164	147	866
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	2	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	2	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	35	9	7	66
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	51	24	14	119
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	69	40	28	193
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	77	55	25	225
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	30	21	15	111

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	116	36	59	36	247

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	2	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/29/2021

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	0	0	0	311	181	150	189	831
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	0	2	15
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	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	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	58	37	38	27	160
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	40	25	15	130

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	150	80	60	60	350

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	2	2	1	2	7
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	277	278	164	147	866
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	2	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	37	38	27	160
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	40	25	15	130

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	150	80	60	60	350

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	2	2	1	2	7
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 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				50%	59%	56%	51%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	54%	51%	51%	56%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	48%	42%	37%	51%	44%
Math Achievement				46%	54%	51%	42%	51%	51%
Math Learning Gains				44%	52%	48%	43%	50%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				30%	51%	45%	48%	51%	45%
Science Achievement				65%	68%	68%	66%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				76%	76%	73%	45%	73%	71%

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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2021					
	2019	45%	55%	-10%	55%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	52%	53%	-1%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

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	
2021						
2019	62%	68%	-6%	67%	-5%	

CIVICS EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019						

HISTORY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019	74%	71%	3%	70%	4%	

ALGEBRA EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019	32%	63%	-31%	61%	-29%	

GEOMETRY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	54%	7%	57%	4%

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 High School utilized a variety of tools in an effort to assess academic progress and evaluate the effectiveness of instruction. For English I, English II and Reading Retake Students, the school utilized USA Test Prep as the Baseline and Mid-Year Assessments followed by the Spring Standardized State FSA Reading Assessment Exam. For the Algebra. 1 and Geometry Mathematics, the school used district Baselines and district Mid-Year Assessments, followed by the Spring Standardized State Assessment End of Course (EOC) Exam. For 11th grade US History, the school used USA Test Prep for Baselines and District Mid-Year Assessments, followed by the Standardized State US History End of Course (EOC) Exam. For Biology, the school used the District Baseline and Mid-Year Assessments, followed by the State Standardized Biology End of Course Exam. Holistic Data Results are demonstrated below.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	36	40
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25	29	32
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39	45	44
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16	20	44
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25	30	35
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11	25	46
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25	29	30
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	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	17	22		17	19						
ELL	23	37	33	22	30	32	29	32		100	94
BLK	47	43		30	23		33			92	91
HSP	42	46	38	26	29	31	45	48		99	96
WHT	55										

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
FRL	43	46	37	27	29	32	46	48		99	95
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	23	69									
ELL	25	50	51	37	36	27	48	53		75	92
BLK	69	59		47	37		82	67			
HSP	48	54	51	46	45	30	63	76		93	90
FRL	51	57	51	45	44	31	67	77		97	88
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	54	50		18	21		60				
ELL	6	22	23	18	36	48	30			92	100
BLK	57	62		43	40		64				
HSP	49	49	36	41	43	45	65	46		97	99
FRL	52	51	37	41	42	48	67	44		96	99

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	50
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	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	546
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
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	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	55
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	50
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?

Our overall 9th grade 2021 ELA state assessment data declined compared to 2019 by 4% in overall proficiency. Our overall 10th grade ELA state assessment score decreased by 8 percentage points from 2019 to 2021. Our Algebra 1 overall EOC assessment data remained the same from 2019 to 2021 at a 32 percent proficiency rate.

Our Geometry students significantly declined from a 61% achievement level in the 2019 EOC to a 22% by achievement level in 2021. The school also witnessed a downward trend in Biology by a decrease of 19 percentage points from 2019 to 2021.

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

The data component that demonstrated the greatest need for improvement was in High School US History which scored a 75% achievement level in 2019 to a 46% achievement level in 2021; an overall downward trend by 29 percentage points.

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

Contributing factors toward a need for improvement within the US History component were lack of student engagement and benchmark alignment. New actions will be held in the areas of:

- taking ownership for students' learning
- setting high expectations for all learners
- believing in students' ability to learn regardless of barriers
- relentlessly pursuing the implementation of what is right for the students
- supporting decisions and policies to improve instruction and advance learning for all students

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

According to the 2018-2019 School Data Map, SLAM High School ELA's lowest 25 percentile evidenced a fourteen percentage point increase, and an overall 9 percentage point upward trend within the same component, when compared to state results. SLAM ELA also had an increase of four percentage points within the overall learning gains component, when compared to the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 state results. When compared to the 2021 Data Map, ELA subgroups and Lowest Percentage groups remained in a stagnant and/or increased in its overall proficiency rating.

Additionally, Algebra 1 remained stagnant across all subgroups and within its proficiency rating when compared from 2019 to 2021 results. These data findings are of great value as it proves that the ELA, Mathematics and SLT's commitment to rigorous coursework as well as technology integration continues to yield proficiency growth.

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

These data finding are of great value as it proves that the ELA, Mathematics and SLT's commitment to rigorous coursework as well as technology integration continues to yield proficiency growth.

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

The SLT and all accountability courses 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 accountability 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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 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. 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. In an effort to promote positive student outcomes for students in all core accountable classes, the SLT will engage in the continuous progress monitoring by conducting bi-weekly data chats. In the effort to increase rigorous content knowledge gains, the SLT will monitor instructional practices and pacing in these core classes, as well engage the team in ongoing data discussions.

Measurable Outcome: 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, bi-weekly and monthly throughout the school year.

Monitoring: 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.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rey Breto (rbreto@slammiami.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: 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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 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. 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.

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 2.0 incidents per 100 students which is less than the state high school rate.

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 High 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 High 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.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				\$236,103.07
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22	
2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	7016 - Sports Leadership Arts Management Charter Hs	Title, I Part A		\$57,066.00	
<i>Notes: Math Instructional Coach</i>						
2110	160-Other Support Personnel	7016 - Sports Leadership Arts Management Charter Hs	Title, I Part A		\$48,640.00	
<i>Notes: Interventionist, Tier 2 & 3 Instructional Support</i>						
2110	160-Other Support Personnel	7016 - Sports Leadership Arts Management Charter Hs	Title, I Part A		\$114,397.07	
<i>Notes: Tutoring</i>						
2110	160-Other Support Personnel	7016 - Sports Leadership Arts Management Charter Hs	Title, I Part A		\$16,000.00	
<i>Notes: Community Involvement Specialist</i>						
Total:					\$236,103.07	