Miami Community Charter School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Miami Community Charter School

101 S REDLAND RD, Florida City, FL 33034

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Mildrelis Rieumont

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	93%
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* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: F (27%)
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

Miami Community Charter School

101 S REDLAND RD, Florida City, FL 33034

[no web address on file]

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)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	96%

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		B	B	C

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.

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fiallo, Raina	Principal	
Delgado, Ashley	Assistant Principal	
Rodriguez, Romy	Assistant Principal	
Olmo, Jenifer	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/30/2021, Mildrelis Rieumont

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
28

Total number of students enrolled at the school
531

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	92	86	83	98	79	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	528
Attendance below 90 percent	1	5	6	6	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	12	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	2	12	1	0	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	37	39	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	52	56	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	17	30	19	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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
Wednesday 9/15/2021

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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	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	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	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	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				52%	62%	57%	41%	62%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				72%	62%	58%	64%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				68%	58%	53%	53%	59%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	69%	63%	43%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				54%	66%	62%	50%	64%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	55%	51%	42%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				40%	55%	53%	31%	58%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	40%	60%	-20%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	64%	-4%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	60%	-7%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	50%	67%	-17%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	69%	-5%	64%	0%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	65%	-23%	60%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	39%	53%	-14%	53%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

I-Ready Reading and I-Ready Math; Performance Matters (5th Grade Science)

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15	16	36
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22	16	38
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18	31	36
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	19	25
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	33	46
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8	26	34
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	15	24	29
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	18	34
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21	23	28
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23	26	31
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		49	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	13			13							
ELL	25	25	35	17	9	12	12				
BLK	13			8							
HSP	29	29	35	19	12	13	19				
FRL	28	30	38	18	13	16	18				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	13	64		33	27						
ELL	47	71	63	47	48	37	30				
BLK	62	64		77	91						
HSP	51	73	70	52	52	42	37				
FRL	51	73	68	53	55	46	40				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD				8							
ELL	32	55	55	40	45	40	12				
BLK	32	69		32	54						
HSP	42	64	52	44	49	44	31				
FRL	41	64	53	43	50	42	31				

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	26
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	210
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	23
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 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	11
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	26
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	26
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

There is an increase in proficiency from AP1/Baseline to AP2/Mid-Year, however, data does not correlate to the FSA results. According to IReady and Performance Matters, the highest academic growth was in 3rd grade ELA. The area with the least growth was in 4th and 5th Mathematics and 5th grade Science.

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

The area with the greatest need of improvement according to progress monitoring is in Science and according to the state assessment, it is in Mathematics.

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

The contributing factor to this need for improvement was the lack of engagement and participation due to remote learning. The new actions that need to the taken to address this need for improvement include active learning such as the use of manipulatives and project based learning.

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

According to Performance Matters and IReady the highest academic growth was in the area of 3rd grade ELA. However, according to the FSA, there were no academic areas that demonstrated improvement.

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

Some of the contributing factors to this improvement were the use and practice of vocabulary terminology, the use of elevation strategies, scaffolding, and implementing higher-order questioning skills.

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

Strategies including differentiated instruction, rigorous instruction, thinking deeply, and applying their knowledge into creating, developing, problem-solving, experimenting, and investigating new ideas will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning.

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.

The professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders include PD's with Learning Science with a focus on B.E.S.T. Standards for ELA and Math; IReady ELA and Math for progress monitoring and instructional support; ICADS; and ESOL and ESE district trainings.

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

Additional services include an after-school tutoring program with One on One Learning for ELA and Math and full enrollment in the 21st Century Program.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Through the practice of aligning learning to standards, instruction is designed to help to ensure higher levels of student achievement, and guide teachers in the process of rigorous instruction and assessment that meets student individual needs of learning.
Measurable Outcome:	Student achievement in all data components will increase by 20 percentage points.
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored through teacher walkthroughs and the use of the rigor index tool for measurement of student learning and engagement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Raina Fiallo (rfiallo@mccsedu.org)
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 will set learning intentions, and use the Cognia Standards, in order to plan backwards. Teachers follow standards based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted. The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps to ensure higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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
-B.E.S.T. Standards
-Universal Design and Backwards Planning-Learning Intentions
2. Differentiated Instruction, based on formative and summative assessments including biweekly i-Ready Standards Mastery assessments (Reading and Math), McGraw Hill Wonders Standards Based Assessments (Biweekly-Reading Grades K-2); Topic Assessments (Science Grade 5).
3. i-Ready ELA and Math online platform is used as ongoing progress monitoring tool, for Assessment Period 1, 2, and 3. Growth monitoring checks take place every 20 instructional days to monitor remedial instruction.
4. Interventions are scheduled based on ongoing progress monitoring (TII (150 minutes weekly) TIII 210 minutes weekly) for ELA and Math, using Wonder Works Reading Intervention Program.
5. Weekly walk throughs to monitor the delivery of instruction.
6. Intervention is provided daily for students in Tier 3, and 3 times weekly for students in Tier 2, the i-Ready instructional grouping profile indicates which skills students need remediation in and provides the instructional resources to provide the intervention.
7. During the school day tutoring, is scheduled for students categorized in the Lowest 25% of Reading and Mathematics.
8. Topic Assessments are used in 5th Grade Science as an ongoing progress monitoring tool.
9. A Reading coach is assigned to mentor the new teachers, and collaborate with teachers in grades 3rd through 5th; to disaggregate biweekly data; and monitor and guide the lesson planning process, as well as the delivery of instruction.
10. A Mathematics coach is assigned to small groups during Math classes, and assigned to mentor the new teachers, and collaborate with teachers in grades 3rd through 5th to disaggregate biweekly data, and monitor and

guide the lesson planning process, as well as the delivery of instruction.
11. A science instructional leader is assigned to work with our STEAM program.
12. ELL coordinator/Liaison is assigned to work with teachers to implement WIDA Can do Descriptors, and methodology as well supporting the delivery of instruction, and implementing ESOL strategies in instruction.

Person Responsible   Raina Fiallo (rfiallo@mccsedu.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Based on the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org website, there is no data reported. School culture and environment will be monitored through the role of the Dean and the implementation of RTi B.

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.

To ensure that the students social-emotional needs of students are being met, the school employs a behavior specialist and a guidance counselor to address the counseling, mentoring, and any other guidance services that the students may need.

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

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 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, encourages active participation, and monitors 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 Tiered population. Working in collaboration with support staff and administration, our teachers design, develop, and deliver interventions. Teacher led tutorials integrate materials and teaching 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.

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.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				$178,133.80
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5000	100-Salaries	0102 - Miami Community Charter School	Title, I Part A		$52,434.00
		Notes: Math Teacher Salary and Tutoring Director				
	5000	100-Salaries	0102 - Miami Community Charter School	Title, I Part A		$21,600.00
		Notes: Small group (reading) Paraprofessional Salary				
	6500	519-Technology-Related Supplies	0102 - Miami Community Charter School	Other Federal		$26,227.80
		Notes: I-Ready Online Program Math and ELA				
	7730	100-Salaries	0102 - Miami Community Charter School	General Fund		$2,000.00
		Notes: ESOL Support Specialist				
	7730	100-Salaries	0102 - Miami Community Charter School	General Fund		$15,334.00
		Notes: Math Coach				
	7730	100-Salaries	0102 - Miami Community Charter School	General Fund		$15,334.00
		Notes: ESE Specialist				

	7730	100-Salaries	0102 - Miami Community Charter School	General Fund		$29,870.00
			Notes: Reading Coach			
	7730	100-Salaries	0102 - Miami Community Charter School	General Fund		$15,334.00
			Notes: Science Coach			
					Total:	**$178,133.80**