

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Academir Charter School Preparatory



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Academir Charter School Preparatory

19185 SW 127TH AVE, Miami, FL 33177

www.academircharterschoolpreparatory.com

Demographics

Principal: Mary Gonzalez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-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)	80%
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: A (64%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: A (69%)
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	N/A
* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Academir Charter School Preparatory

19185 SW 127TH AVE, Miami, FL 33177

www.academircharterschoolpreparatory.com

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)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	80%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	99%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		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.

The mission of AcadeMir Charter School Preparatory is to provide students with a well grounded Kindergarten through Eighth grade school education through a challenging program, focused on mathematics and science using innovative, reform based instructional methods in a stimulating and nurturing environment that fosters maximum student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Academir Charter School Preparatory is to provide students with a challenging and rigorous curriculum enabling students to be well prepared for life through adherence to the mission, shared purpose, and clearly articulated goals.

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
Ledo, Mary Kristina	Principal	
Plantada, Christopher	Assistant Principal	
Triana, Marianne	Assistant Principal	
Rizo, Yusimi	SAC Member	
Tabares, Erica	Reading Coach	
Lorie, Marlene	Instructional Coach	Math and Science

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Mary Gonzalez

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.*

NA

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.*

NA

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

72

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,147

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

17

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

22

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	1	3	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	
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

Tuesday 9/6/2022

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	146	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	293
Attendance below 90 percent	3	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	2	5	2	8	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	1	15	16	25	6	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	65	57	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	65	57	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	9	22	10	18	13	8	10	0	0	0	0	94

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	4	23	18	30	39	39	17	15	0	0	0	0	185

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	146	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	293
Attendance below 90 percent	3	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	2	5	2	8	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	1	15	16	25	6	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	65	57	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	65	57	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	9	22	10	18	13	8	10	0	0	0	0	94

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	4	23	18	30	39	39	17	15	0	0	0	0	185

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	62%	62%	55%				63%	63%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						62%	61%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						63%	57%	54%
Math Achievement	67%	51%	42%				61%	67%	62%
Math Learning Gains	65%						56%	63%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%						46%	56%	52%
Science Achievement	67%	60%	54%				59%	56%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	68%	59%					80%	78%

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	65%	60%	5%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	64%	-5%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	62%	60%	2%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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	65%	67%	-2%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	57%	69%	-12%	64%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2022					
	2019	58%	65%	-7%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	59%	53%	6%	53%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
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					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

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	31	48	37	37	56	59	35	40			
ELL	52	49	44	60	62	61	63	62			
BLK	47	62		47	67						
HSP	61	56	47	67	66	61	67	71	81		
FRL	59	56	47	66	64	61	64	73	80		
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	28	52	45	33	44	31					
ELL	54	60	48	54	51	50	55	53			
BLK	53			50							
HSP	62	61	52	58	51	47	63	59			
FRL	62	60	46	59	53	49	63	56			
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	24	42	47	24	42	50	18				
ELL	55	61	63	52	49	45	45				
BLK	47	20		53	40						
HSP	64	65	68	61	56	46	60				
FRL	61	62	67	61	54	43	53				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	647
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
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	56
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	64
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	64
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?

A downward trend in learning gains in ELA

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

ELA learning gains indicated a downward trend

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

A decrease in foundational skills coupled with the pandemic affecting primary ELA skills.

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

Math learning gains and Math lowest 25% gains showed improvement, both were previous SIP goals.

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

Small group instruction, Tier intervention in I, II and III. Data communications meetings all assisted the previous year.

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

Increased PDs and small groups will be utilized to ensure acceleration. Curriculum condensing and accelerated pace will also be used.

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.

District based PDs are offered to increase acceleration rates.

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

Increased pedagogy, a coaching academy, a 4 day immersion in BEST standards and finally, a renewed look at morale and culture are all ways to ensure sustainability.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

A large portion of Hispanic students are part of the population of the schools. A focus on learning gains in ELA indicates that all students need assistance in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

ELA learning gains will increase by 5% in comparison from PM1 to PM2.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The FAST and Iready progress monitoring will be used to measure.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erica Tabares (922727@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

TIERED interventions and differentiated instruction with bi weekly based assessments as per the NEW BEST standards

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Previous use of bi weeklies increases proficiency rates

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

According to our progress monitoring tool Iready, 82% of our kindergarten students for the 2021-2022 school year are proficient in reading. The lowest domains are phonics, HFW, and vocabulary. 59% of our 1st grade students are proficient in reading. The lowest domains are vocabulary and comprehension. 54% of our 2nd grade students are proficient and their lowest domains are phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension of informational text.

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

According to our progress monitoring tool Iready, 78% of our 3rd grade students for the 2021-2022 school year are proficient in reading. The lowest domains are vocabulary and comprehension of fictional text. 62% of our 4th grade students are proficient in reading. The lowest domains are vocabulary and comprehension. 64% of our 5th grade students are proficient and their lowest domains are vocabulary and comprehension.

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)

With proper interventions and support our goal for kindergarten is to reach an 85% proficiency. Our goal for 1st is a 90% proficiency and our goal for 2nd grade is a 65% proficiency.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

With proper interventions and support our goal for 3rd grade is to reach an 70% proficiency. Our goal for 4th grade is an 85% proficiency and our goal for 5th grade is a 70% proficiency.

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.

MTSS RTI Tier 2 interventions begin the first week of September. Students will be provided interventions for 30 minutes daily on specific skills based on their progress monitoring data. Data chats will be held every 6 weeks to discuss student progress within the intervention program. Those who need further Tier 3 interventions will be provided an additional 30 minutes twice a week. Those students in Tier 3 will be given a growth monitoring assessment monthly. This data will be provided during SST meetings to determine if further support is needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Tabares, Erica, 922727@dadeschools.net

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. Â§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?

We will be using Iready to close the gaps and provide interventions for our at risk students. The lessons, activities, assessments, and growth monitoring tool within the Iready program are all aligned to the BEST standards.

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 Iready program identifies the specific skills that each student needs in order to reach proficiency. Students will work on their adaptive pathway to close the gaps, teachers will assign specific lessons within the program to reinforce their tier 1 lesson and will assign remediation lesson to target their intervention 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
Students will take the Iready AP 1 diagnostic assessment the first week of September. Immediately following AP1, students who fall within a specific score range will be placed on Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions. Teachers will be trained on how to read, analyze, and use the data to drive their instruction using differentiated instructional strategies.	Tabares, Erica, 922727@dadeschools.net
Teachers will meet with Mrs. Tabares every 6 weeks to review the data and determine if the students need further support. Teachers will be formally trained on how use the intervention data in order to complete a Request for Assistance (RFA) correctly and thoroughly.	Tabares, Erica, 922727@dadeschools.net
Students who are found to need further support will be placed in Tier 3 interventions and will take a Growth Monitoring assessment monthly. Students will receive an additional hour of support weekly. Teachers will meet with Mrs. Tabares every 6 weeks to review the data. The SPED and MTSS coordinators will conduct the SST meetings with parents using the data provided from Tier 3 interventions.	Tabares, Erica, etabares@recscharter.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.

ACSP strives to provide a working environment that is supportive and fulfilling environment. One of the non-negotiables for all staff is that ALL student learn at ACSP. Providing the staff the resources to ensure that all students succeed and that the the learning conditions that meet the needs of all students. Clear expectations and multiple clarified spot check assists in ensuring understanding of roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations.

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

All stakeholders in all positions are required to assist in creating a positive learning environment.