

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Miami Community Charter Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Miami Community Charter Middle School

18720 SW 352ND ST, Florida City, FL 33034

www.mccedu.org

Demographics

Principal: **Stephany Papili**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/28/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
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 (54%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (44%)
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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Miami Community Charter Middle School

18720 SW 352ND ST, Florida City, FL 33034

www.mccedu.org

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>98%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>98%</p>

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
Papili, Stephany	Principal	
Rieumont, Mildrelis	Assistant Principal	
Mejia, Raquel	Assistant Principal	
Qureshi, Wajida	Instructional Coach	
Marquez, Abinel	School Counselor	
Lindsay , Novelette	Dean	
Hazelton, Caroline	Instructional Coach	
Rodriguez, Lianet	Instructional Coach	
Saavedra, Ruben	Instructional Technology	
	Other	
Mitchell, Michelle	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 9/28/2021, Stephany Papili

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

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

15

Total number of students enrolled at the school

315

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

2

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

3

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	101	106	108	0	0	0	0	315
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	15	22	0	0	0	0	46
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	5	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	1	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	38	32	0	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	44	38	0	0	0	0	142
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	80	38	0	0	0	0	202
	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	83	80	44	0	0	0	0	207

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	97	104	113	0	0	0	0	314
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	25	33	0	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	29	29	0	0	0	0	82
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	39	49	0	0	0	0	114

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	97	104	113	0	0	0	0	314
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	25	33	0	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	29	29	0	0	0	0	82
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	39	49	0	0	0	0	114

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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				42%	58%	54%	38%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	58%	54%	50%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	52%	47%	46%	52%	47%
Math Achievement				42%	58%	58%	34%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				61%	56%	57%	46%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	54%	51%	48%	55%	51%
Science Achievement				29%	52%	51%	41%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				64%	74%	72%	50%	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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	41%	58%	-17%	54%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	39%	56%	-17%	52%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
08	2021					
	2019	41%	60%	-19%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	34%	58%	-24%	55%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	28%	53%	-25%	54%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
08	2021					
	2019	31%	40%	-9%	46%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	2%	43%	-41%	48%	-46%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	64%	68%	-4%	67%	-3%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	61%	73%	-12%	71%	-10%

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	75%	63%	12%	61%	14%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	68%	54%	14%	57%	11%

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 General Mathematics, Performance Matters (Topic and District Based Assessments).

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13%	23%	28%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18%	24%	37%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24%	36%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5%	10%	11%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students		54%	
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43%	50%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3	10	50%
Science	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
All Students	0%	11%		

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		22	33		21	31					
ELL	24	31	42	15	20	41	7	35	28		
BLK	29	24		14	17		9				
HSP	33	36	39	18	19	39	28	43	53		
FRL	33	34	36	18	19	38	27	43	52		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	20			20							
ELL	23	50	49	32	55	58	6	50	52		
BLK	52	63		24	67				64		
HSP	40	55	51	44	61	62	29	67	75		
FRL	42	55	50	41	61	64	30	64	75		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
ELL	15	46	39	20	45	42	16	32	24		
BLK	36	38		20	29			55	38		
HSP	38	51	48	35	47	54	41	50	38		
FRL	38	49	44	33	46	52	42	52	39		

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	32
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	22
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	321
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
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	27
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	
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	19
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	33
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	32
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/EOC Data. According to Performance Matters and I-Ready, the highest academic growth was in the area of Geometry and 8th Grade ELA/Reading. The area with the least growth was in Mathematics.

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 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 be taken to address this need for improvement include active learning such as the use of manipulatives.

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

According to Performance Matters and I-Ready the highest academic growth was in the area of Geometry and 8th Grade ELA. However, according to the FSA/EOC, 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.

New BEST Standards, HMH (new MS ELA curriculum). I-Ready Data Based PD (Reading and Mathematics), district based PDs and trainings (Mathematics Icads), MS ELA through ESOL /ESE PDs.

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

Some additional services that will be implemented to ensure the sustainability of improvement are after-school tutoring services provided by one-on-one tutoring services.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If instruction is increased in content areas including ELA/Reading, Mathematics (Algebra 1 & Geometry), Science (8th Grade and Biology), and Social Studies (Civics) then students' achievement will improve. The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps to ensure higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment. Teachers follow standards-based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted.
Measurable Outcome:	Student overall achievement in English Language Arts/Reading, Mathematics (General, Algebra 1 & Geometry), Science (8th Grade & Biology), and Social Studies (Civics) will increase by 12 percentage points from 33% to 45%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored by ongoing data progress including performance platforms such as Performance Matters (Topic/District-Based Assessments) and I-Ready Reading and Mathematics.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephany Papili (spapili7@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool (ELEOT) and Rigor Index Marzano's Taxonomy and Depth of Knowledge) will continue to be implemented in order to increase the level of rigor in instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps to ensure higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment. Teachers follow standards based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted. Marzano's Taxonomy and 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, Planning, and Digging Deep in B.E.S.T Standards, Read180 Data-Driven Instruction, ESOL/ESE Professional Development Trainings, and Mathematics Icads.

Person Responsible Stephany Papili (spapili7@dadeschools.net)

Implementation of IReady Reading online instruction.

Person Responsible Raquel Mejia (rmejia1@mccsedu.org)

Implementation of IReady Mathematics online instruction.

Person Responsible Mildrelis Rieumont (mrieumont@mccsedu.org)

Ellevation in Class for ELL instruction as well as ELL PD.

Person Responsible Mildrelis Rieumont (mrieumont@mccsedu.org)

Ongoing progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Raquel Mejia (rmejia1@mccsedu.org)

Topic/District Based Assessments using Performance Matters Assessments using iReady Standards Mastery.

Person Responsible Mildrelis Rieumont (mrieumont@mccsedu.org)

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.

Based on the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org website, there is one data reported. School culture and environment will be monitored through the role of the Dean and the implementation of RTi B. Core Values and Class Expectations are in place and are continuously monitored.

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.

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 is 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.

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

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

Principal – Stephany Papili

Assistant Principals and Instructional Leaders - Mildred Rieumont (Math & SS) and Raquel Mejia (ELA/

ESE) Instructional Leader- (ESOL)- Mrs Auster
 Instructional Leader-World Language-Lianet Rodriguez
 Instructional Leader-Digital Literacy-Ruben Saavedra
 Instructional Leader-Science-Wajida Qureshi
 Technology Specialist – Marcos Padron
 School Psychologist – Brenda Johnson
 Speech-Language Pathologist – Ms. McCalla
 Guidance Counselor (Mental Health)– Abinel Marquez
 Mental Health Coordinator- Barbara Martin
 Dean of Students – Novelette Lindsay
 School Guardian- Julian Valladares
 Jila Rezaie - Executive Director
 Guidance Counselor (Mental Health):

The guidance counselor supports learning through the provision of discussion forums around such key issues as effective program design, through effective assessment strategies and interpersonal relations for our students. The guidance counselor leads many student support services meetings and facilitates the productive outcome that enhances the learning environment for many of our students. The guidance counselor impacts both the affective and affective domains of learning school wide.

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				\$285,665.05
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22	
7730	100-Salaries	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	General Fund		\$44,931.54	
<i>Notes: Civics</i>						
7730	100-Salaries	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	General Fund		\$24,263.50	
<i>Notes: ELA Teacher</i>						
7730	100-Salaries	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	General Fund		\$48,333.79	
<i>Notes: ELA/ELL Teacher</i>						
7730	100-Salaries	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	General Fund		\$44,931.54	
<i>Notes: Math Teacher</i>						
7730	100-Salaries	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	General Fund		\$17,847.26	
<i>Notes: MH Math Teacher</i>						
7730	100-Salaries	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	General Fund		\$27,248.99	
<i>Notes: MH Science Teacher</i>						
6500	519-Technology-Related Supplies	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	Other Federal		\$24,482.71	

			<i>Notes: I-Ready Reading and Mathematics Online and Workbooks</i>			
	5900	500-Materials and Supplies	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	General Fund		\$1,953.12
			<i>Notes: Civics Workbooks</i>			
	5900	500-Materials and Supplies	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	General Fund		\$44,465.20
			<i>Notes: HMH ELA Instructional Curriculum</i>			
	5900	500-Materials and Supplies	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	General Fund		\$4,207.40
			<i>Notes: General Mathematics, Algebra 1, and Geometry Workbooks</i>			
	3376	310-Professional and Technical Services	6048 - Miami Community Charter Middle School	General Fund		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Learning Science B.E.S.T ELA and Mathematics PD Training.</i>			
					Total:	\$285,665.05