Miami Community Charter Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 9/30/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
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 (42%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (43%)
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 Middle School

18720 SW 352ND ST, Florida City, FL 33034

www.mccedu.org

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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	92%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	98%

School Grades History

Year	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
Papili, Stephany	Principal	
Rieumont, Mildrelis	Assistant Principal	
Mejia, Raquel	Assistant Principal	
Lindsay , Novelette	School Counselor	
Marquez, Abinel	School Counselor	
Galdamez, Diana	Dean	
Barrios, Andrea	Math Coach	
Mitchell, Michelle	Reading Coach	
Hazelton, Caroline	ELL Compliance Specialist	
Saavedra, Ruben	Instructional Technology	
Rezaie, Jila	Other	Executive Director

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 9/30/2022, Stephany Papili

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

9

Total number of students enrolled at the school

320

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

4

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

1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	104	111	0	0	0	0	320
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	21	20	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	6
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	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	43	43	0	0	0	0	120
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	43	46	0	0	0	0	144
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	74	83	0	0	0	0	227

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	65	72	0	0	0	0	196

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	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	

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	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		
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	

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	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		
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	

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	26%	55%	50%				42%	58%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	34%						55%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	25%						52%	52%	47%
Math Achievement	23%	43%	36%				42%	58%	58%
Math Learning Gains	52%						61%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%						64%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	54%	53%				29%	52%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	53%	64%	58%				64%	74%	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	2022					
	2019	41%	58%	-17%	54%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	39%	56%	-17%	52%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
08	2022					
	2019	41%	60%	-19%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	34%	58%	-24%	55%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	28%	53%	-25%	54%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
08	2022					
	2019	31%	40%	-9%	46%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	2%	43%	-41%	48%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	64%	68%	-4%	67%	-3%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	61%	73%	-12%	71%	-10%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	75%	63%	12%	61%	14%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	68%	54%	14%	57%	11%

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	10	16	9	5	43	54					
ELL	16	31	21	16	47	67	20	45	46		
BLK	27	31		13	36						
HSP	25	34	25	23	53	74	31	54	63		
FRL	25	34	26	23	52	71	31	53	61		

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		

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	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		

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	440
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
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	44
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, however, data does not correlate to the FSA/EOC Data. According to I-Ready, the highest academic growth was in the area of 6th grade. The area with the least growth was in Mathematics

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 is ELA/Reading and Mathematics and according to the state assessment, it is in ELA/Reading 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 lack of social skills, problem-solving, decision making, high standards, and rigorous instruction. The new actions that need to be taken to address this need for improvement include establishing a learning environment with high expectations and active learning.

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

According to I-Ready the highest academic growth was in the area of
6th Grade ELA. However, according to the FSA/EOC, the area with the most improvement was in the Low 25% 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 were the use of differentiated instruction and small group support.

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

Strategies include implementing and elevating student engagement through rigorous teaching and instilling high expectations.

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

In addition to having a Reading and Math Coach for instructional support, professional development opportunities are provided in the areas of the BEST Standards (ELA and Math) as well as training with the new Math/ELA curriculum (HMH) and progress monitoring tools (I-Ready and Performance Matters).

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

In addition to having a Reading and Math Coach for instructional support, we have also established an extended learning center where students are able to apply their learning and enhance their skills through digital online progress monitoring programs.

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.**	If the instruction is increased in content areas including ELA/Reading, Mathematics,Science (8th Grade and Biology), and Social Studies (Civics) then students' achievement will improve. The practice of elevating higher standards also helps to ensure a 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: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective 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 5 percentage points from 42% to 47%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	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: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	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: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The practice of aligning learning to standards also helps to ensure a 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
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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

N/A

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

N/A

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)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

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.

N/A

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

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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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

N/A

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.

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 school culture and environment.

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)- Donna Auster
Instructional Leader-World Language-Lianet Rodriguez
Instructional Leader-Digital Literacy-Ruben Saavedra
Instructional Leader-Science-Wajida Qureshi
Reading Coach- Michelle Mitchel
Math Coach - Karinne Lopez
Technology Specialist – Marcos Padron
School Psychologist – Brenda Johnson
Speech-Language Pathologist – Ms. McCalla
Counselor- Novelette Lindsay
Guidance Counselor (Mental Health)– Abinel Marquez
Mental Health Coordinator- Doris Garcia
Dean of Students – Araselis Plaza
School Guardian- Julian Valladares
Jila Rezaie - Executive Director