Miami Community Charter School

2022-23 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: 11/30/2020

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (51%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (46%)
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	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	93%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	100%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	B

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At MCCS (Miami Community Charter School), our faculty is committed to empowering our students through mentorship to be held accountable by teaching them to embrace responsibility, demonstrate mutual respect, and engage in open communication. Our continuous collaboration of all stakeholders will provide a safe and nurturing environment which promotes students' social-emotional and academic growth. Students will feel secure in embracing new challenges by identifying their individual strengths, motivating them through goals, and celebrating their victories. Through our endeavors and dedication to community service, our students will achieve their full potential and become productive members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As life long learners, MCCS students will take ownership to transform obstacles into opportunities for a better community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 11/30/2020, Mildrelis Rieumont

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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
29

Total number of students enrolled at the school
533

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

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	88	88	87	89	96	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	533
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	10	5	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	1	2	3	3	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	1	4	2	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	3	5	2	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	31	19	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	27	16	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	3	9	18	8	28	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	2	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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
Friday 9/30/2022

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	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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	

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	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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	37%	62%	56%				52%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						72%	62%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						68%	58%	53%
Math Achievement	42%	58%	50%				53%	69%	63%
Math Learning Gains	67%						54%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	78%						45%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	17%	64%	59%				40%	55%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	40%	60%	-20%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	64%	-4%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	53%	60%	-7%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	50%	67%	-17%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	69%	-5%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					
	2019	42%	65%	-23%	60%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	39%	53%	-14%	53%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	11	55		33	45						
ELL	33	57	68	44	61	79	16				
BLK	35	42		29	80						
HSP	37	57	62	43	66	78	16				
FRL	36	56	60	42	67	78	17				

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	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				
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	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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	414
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 to the spring FSA results in 3rd and 4th grade ELA and Math. The highest academic growth was in 3rd and 4th grade FSA mathematics. The area with the least growth was 5th grade ELA and Math (based on FSA Achievement).

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The area with the greatest need of improvement according to progress monitoring and spring FCAT results is in 5th grade science and according to FSA it is 5th grade ELA and 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 result of remote learning that took place prior to this school year. The new actions that need to be taken to address this need for improvement include active learning such as project based learning and real-world connections to learning.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

According to the FSA spring assessment results, the most improved academic area was mathematics.

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 included the focus on vocabulary practice, the use of manipulatives when problem-solving, the implementation of instructional scaffolding and practice of higher-order questioning strategies and 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 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 program that provides homework and tutoring assistance and full enrollment in the 21st Century Program.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Through the practice of aligning learning to benchmarks, 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: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Student achievement in all data components will increase by 20 percentage points.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	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: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The practice of aligning learning to benchmarks 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 benchmarks based instruction to ensure that their students meet the demands targeted. The practice of aligning learning to benchmarks also helps to ensure higher level of student achievement, and guides teachers in the process of assessment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Teachers follow benchmarks 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 benchmarks with assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

PD opportunities pertaining to:Rigor;BEST;Instructional Delivery.
Differentiated Instruction based on the results of all assessments.
i-Ready online platform-ongoing progress monitoring tool. Growth monitoring checks scheduled every 20 instructional days to monitor remedial instruction.
Interventions are scheduled based on ongoing progress monitoring for ELA and Math.
Bi-weekly walk throughs to monitor the delivery of instruction.
Topic Assessments used in 5th Science as an ongoing progress monitoring tool.
A Reading coach is assigned to collaborate with teachers in grades 3-5 to disaggregate data, guide the lesson planning process and the delivery of instruction.
A Math coach is assigned to collaborate with teachers in grades 3-5 to disaggregate data, guide the lesson planning process, and the delivery of instruction.
A science instructional leader is assigned to work with grade 5 science teachers and STEAM program.

ELL coordinator assigned to work with teachers to implement WIDA Can do Descriptors and implementing ESOL strategies in instruction.

Person Responsible   Raina Fiallo (rfiallo@mccsedu.org)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Area of Focus: Phonics and Phonemic Awareness.
Effect: Students that master grade level phonics and phonemic awareness will increase reading fluency therefore resulting in improved grade level reading comprehension.
Data: Student progress will be measured through the IReady Reading platform (AP1, AP2, AP3 and growth monitoring checks).

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Area of Focus: Reading Comprehension
Effect: Students that can comprehension what they are reading will improve grade level reading achievement.
Data: Student progress will be measured through IReady Reading Platform (AP1, AP2, AP3, and growth monitoring checks)

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

All K-2 students will gain one year academic growth (fall to spring) in reading based on IReady AP1 to AP3 results.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

All 3-5 students will gain one year academic growth (fall to spring) in reading based on IReady AP1 to AP3 results.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

The following assessments will be used to measure the desired outcomes:
-IReady (AP1 in Fall, AP2 in Winter, and AP3 in Spring)
-FAST Assessments (PM1 in Fall, PM2 in Winter, and PM3 in Spring)
- IReady (growth monitoring checks every 20 instructional days)

The combined use of all assessments will allow for consistent and ongoing progress monitoring to occur throughout the school-year. As assessment results are measured, instructional decisions including intervention and remediation are implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Fiallo, Raina, rfiallo@mccsedu.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The I-Ready reading program will allow for student academic growth in reading to be assessed and measured by Typical Growth Measure and Stretch Growth Measure. These growth measurements allow for student progression in reading to be measured and analyzed based on reading instruction (BEST ELA Standards) and placement level for below and on grade level students therefore aligning with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The I-Ready reading platform measures student placement and areas of need during AP1 testing. Throughout the school-year, I-Ready adjusts the student's reading instruction based on what the skills the student is deficient in and assesses accordingly. The implementation of the I-Ready reading platform has demonstrated effectiveness in closing the achievement gap for K-5 students.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
- K-5th grade ELA lesson planning will follow Miami Dade's Pacing Guides and use the Pacing Guides to lesson plan effectively. - 1st-5th grade students will participate in small group instruction with a focus on closing achievement gaps based on student data and needs. - K-5th grade teachers will use effective instructional delivery including differentiated instruction, scaffolding, and hands-on learning to support student achievement in reading skills and strategies. - K-5th grade teachers will provide on-going instruction in the areas of comprehension, vocabulary, phonics, phonemic awareness, and fluency either through intervention, remediation, or enrichment (based on student need). -An assigned reading coach will work with 3rd-5th grade teachers to guide lesson planning, instructional delivery, and rigorous learning. -On-going formative and summative assessments and data collection will take place to measure reading growth and proficiency per child.	Fiallo, Raina, rfiallo@mccsedu.org

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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. MCCS also works with the providedMiami-Dade Mental Health Coordinator in support of referred Tier 3 behaviors.

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

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.

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.