

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Miami Community Charter School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Miami Community Charter School

101 S REDLAND RD, Florida City, FL 33034

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rieumont, Mildrelis	Principal	
Delgado, Ashley	Assistant Principal	
Olmo, Jenifer	Dean	
Marquez, Abinel	School Counselor	
Rezaie, Jila	Other	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

NA

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored after each progress monitoring PM1, PM2 and PM3 as well as upon completion of diagnostic assessments. The data will be disaggregated during teachers' PLCs and academic instructional leadership team meetings.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	100%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	93%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	1	5	14	0	0	0	24
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	40	41	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	38	41	40	0	0	0	119
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	4	6	10	5	11	12	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	1	2	3	3	2	15	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	1	4	2	4	2	1	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	3	5	2	7	7	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	31	19	37	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	16	56	0	0	0	99
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	9	18	8	28	25	0	0	0	91

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	2	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	4	6	10	5	11	12	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	1	2	3	3	2	15	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	1	4	2	4	2	1	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	3	5	2	7	7	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	31	19	37	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	16	56	0	0	0	99
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	9	18	8	28	25	0	0	0	91

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	2	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	34	60	53	37	62	56	28		
ELA Learning Gains				56			29		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60			38		
Math Achievement*	35	66	59	42	58	50	19		
Math Learning Gains				67			12		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				78			16		
Science Achievement*	28	58	54	17	64	59	20		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	58	63	59	57			48		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	206
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	414
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	2	1
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	58			
HSP	40	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	41			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	40	Yes	1	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	52			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	52			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	34			35			28					58
SWD	18			12							3	47
ELL	26			35			24				5	58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57			33							3	
HSP	32			35			28				5	58
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	34			36			26				5	58

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	37	56	60	42	67	78	17					57
SWD	11	55		33	45							54
ELL	33	57	68	44	61	79	16					57
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	35	42		29	80							
HSP	37	57	62	43	66	78	16					57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	36	56	60	42	67	78	17					56

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	28	29	38	19	12	16	20					48
SWD	13			13								31
ELL	25	25	35	17	9	12	12					48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	13			8								
HSP	29	29	35	19	12	13	19					48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	28	30	38	18	13	16	18					48

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	31%	56%	-25%	54%	-23%
04	2023 - Spring	32%	58%	-26%	58%	-26%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	48%	52%	-4%	50%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	42%	63%	-21%	59%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	34%	64%	-30%	61%	-27%
05	2023 - Spring	33%	58%	-25%	55%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	26%	50%	-24%	51%	-25%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data reveals that 5th grade ELA had the lowest gain of 7% from PM1 to PM3. However when comparing Spring 2022 FSA Assessment to Spring 2023 FAST Assessment, the areas of lowest performance are 3rd and 4th grade Mathematics as well as 4th grade ELA.

Contributing factors include:

- Instructional personnel lack of training on new content benchmarks
- Lack of real world application of content/relevancy
- Changes in instructional staff in 5th grade

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The subject area with the greatest decline from the prior year was 4th grade Mathematics.

The contributing factors include:

- Instructional personnel lack of training on new content benchmarks
- Inconsistent progress monitoring tools throughout the year

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is 5th grade science. Some of the factors that contributed to this gap was the lack of instructional personnel, delayed vocabulary instruction and reading strategies, students lack of background information.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data that showed the most improvement from PM1 to PM3 was 3rd grade mathematics. While Science showed the most improvement from spring 2022 to 2023 on the Florida Statewide Science assessment.

Some of the contributing factors were the intervention of instructional coaches, small group instruction, targeted tutoring with emphasis on vocabulary, real world application and formative assessment accompanied by timely feedback.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Based on our Early Warning Sign Data, two potential areas of concern are:

- Attendance in our rising 5th grade class
- Current number of level 1 students in our rising 5th grade class

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Based on our data, our instructional priorities are:

- Increasing proficiency in 5th grade ELA
- Increasing proficiency in 5th grade Science
- Increasing proficiency in 4th grade math
- Sustain a positive school culture
- Secure a conducive school climate

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A positive school culture is essential for the attainment of instructional goals. A healthy school culture must reflect a supportive and conducive learning environment, where all stakeholders are considered and addressed for the full academic and socio-emotional development of learners.

Measurable Outcome:

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

A positive culture will lead to 90% teacher retention.

Monitoring:

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

In order to achieve our goal of building a positive culture and retain teachers, our dean of students in conjunction with our school's guidance counselor work to monitor the academic and socio-emotional needs of students. The school's administration and academic leadership mentor and guide both teachers and students. Instructional, grade level leaders work with team teachers to disaggregate data and understand and plan instruction and guide our students. In addition to monitoring the well being of our students, we offer mental health days to our teachers and incentives for reduced absences and/or perfect attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mildrelis Rieumont (mrieumont@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Our school implements a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS). This is to proactively implement an inclusive framework that addresses behavior and instruction to maximize student achievement and support students' socio-emotional, and behavior needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is an evidenced based intervention that addresses the child as whole and suggests tiers of support that are individualized and comprehensive.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

One of the areas of focus based on 2022-2023 overall data is reading in 4th and 5th grade as well as mathematics in 3rd grade, as these accountability groups have the greatest gap in achievement level in comparison to the state.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Through intervention strategies and collaboration between the leadership team and teachers, student achievement in all data components will increase by 10 percentage points.

Monitoring:

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

In order to monitor the school's area of focus for the desired outcomes, the following progress monitoring tools will be employed, in addition to teacher's formal and informal observations and the use of rigor index and ELEOT teachers' observation tool. The following progress monitoring assessment will be utilize to monitor students' data.

- Biweekly iReady Standards Mastery Assessment in (reading 2nd -5th)
- McGraw Hill Wonders Standard Based Reading Assessments - biweekly grades (K-1)
- iReady AP1, AP2, AP3
- FAST PM1, PM2, PM3
- Star Early Literacy Assessments
- Performance Matters District Assessments- Math 3-5
- Baseline and Performance Matters District Assessments - 5th grade Science

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mildrelis Rieumont (mrieumont@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Benchmark and data driven instruction will constitute the core of our strategy, as well as backward planning to align the learning outcomes with the instruction and teachers' formative assessments in all content areas.

Cooperative learning and small group tutoring, along technology with emphasis on reading comprehension and math fluency align with the Florida's definition of evidenced-based reading instructional and intervention programs.

In ELA, these strategies incorporate explicit, systematic and sequential approaches to teaching vocabulary, fluency and text comprehension. The strategies allow students to work on group activities related to informational texts in which they make predictions, write summaries, make and interpret graphic organizers and outlines, and answer questions relating to characters, settings, and problem solutions. The instruction in mathematics and science incorporate explicit instruction, cross curricular teaching with emphasis on real world application, vocabulary, fluency and student achievement in general.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These evidence-based practices and programs are suggested on Evidence for ESSA. The practices address the needs of students in all content areas of reading comprehension, writing and mathematics.

These identified evidence-based practices have proven to raise student reading proficiency and student achievement in general.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Coaching

Literacy Coaching: Our ELA instructional coach provides coaching for teachers by supporting them in the classroom through modeling best practices, reflecting and addressing areas of needs. Additionally, the instructional coach works with small groups of students, implements and monitors instructional programs to improve students learning. The coach disaggregates data and assist plans differentiated and targeted instruction for students.

Mathematics Coaching: Our mathematics instructional coach provides coaching for teachers by supporting them in the classroom through modeling best practices, reflecting and addressing areas of needs. Additionally, the instructional coach works with small groups of students, implements and monitors instructional programs to improve students learning. The coach disaggregates data and assist plans differentiated and targeted instruction for students.

Our science instructional leader provides support to 5th grade students through small groups and targeted intervention. She aids the classroom teacher with instructional planning, data disaggregation, differentiated instruction, science experiments and the use of technology to reinforce the content.

ELL coordinator/ liaison is assigned to assist teachers to implement Ellevation inClass suggested strategies and Wida Can do Descriptors, as well as methodology that support the delivery of instruction to ELL students.

ESE Intervention Specialist

Our ESE specialist assists with the academic and social education of ESE children in the classroom and/ or other setting, by facilitating best practices that address the needs of ESE students. She provides targeted academic support to ESE students as specified on their respective intervention plan, by following a detailed intervention schedule.

Assessment

Data driven and differentiated instruction is based on formal assessments such as FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments PM1, PM2, PM3, biweekly iReady standards mastery (reading 2nd -5th). McGraw Hill Wonders Standard-based Reading Assessments - biweekly grades (K-1)

Differentiated Instruction

DI instruction is planned based on the dissaggregated data , as often as formal assessments take place. Grade level teams collaborate weekly on PLC meetings in order to plan all content area for the whole grade level.

Professional Learning

Professional developments are programmed throughout the year.

- Progress monitoring tool such as iReady for selected teachers.
- Digital programs and platforms such as IXL, Performance Matters-
- Data Analysis- Performance Matters- Baseball Card Report
- Differentiated instruction

Person Responsible: Mildrelis Rieumont (mrieumont@dadeschools.net)

By When: End of 2023-2024

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to the 2021-22 Accountability Report, 33% of students with disabilities scored proficient in the area of Mathematics and 11% scored proficient in the area of English Language Arts.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school goal is to have 43% of students with disabilities score proficient in the area of Mathematics and 21% score proficient in the area of English Language Arts based on the FAST PM3 Spring 2024 Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through progress monitoring including (PM1, PM2, iReady Reading AP1, AP2 and ELA Standards Mastery assessments as well as Mathematics district based topic assessments).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Delgado (adelgado@mccsedu.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The targeted students are placed in intervention and intensive courses in Reading/Math, where I-Ready Reading/Math and Imagine Learning are monitored to guide instruction and monitor progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The school follows the Student Progression Plan for placement and intervention.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Miami Community Charter Elementary School's budget is developed in August based on the enrollment. The budget is reviewed and approved by the board of directors and in accordance with the school's operational needs reported by the principal.

The board conducts a mid year review of the budget, and the revisions may be made based on need. The driving force of making financial decisions is school's instructional and academic programs, which includes sustaining the qualified teachers and instructional staff. Miami Community Charter School is a Title I school, and therefore the allocation plan is approved by the board of directors. School's compliance with Title I requirements is audited by Title I Administration twice a year.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

NA

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

NA

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

NA

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

NA

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

NA

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Rieumont, Mildrelis, mrieumont@dadeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

NA

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NA

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

NA	Mitchell, Michelle, mmitchell@mccsedu.org
----	---

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school’s webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

In our school, all stakeholders will have access to our SIP. We make them available through email/ shared google drive. During our professional development community and/or department and academic leadership team meetings we read the document and amend throughout the school year as needed.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school’s mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child’s progress.

List the school’s webpage* where the school’s Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

One of the school's priority is to keep parents informed. To fulfill this mission, we employ various communication platforms such as our school's website and social media. In addition we communicate through blackboard messages and class dojo messages. We host Parent to Parent meetings through zoom and plan school's expos and special events to increase parent involvement. Our open door policy allows us to sustain continued communication with parents. We convene progress monitoring meetings as needed to address specific needs of students.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The school's plan to strengthen the academic programs and quality learning include providing and supporting teachers with professional development opportunities which range include:

- Progress monitoring tool such as iReady for selected teachers.
- BEST Math Instructional Materials
- Digital programs and platforms
- Data Analysis- Performance Matters

The interventions of instructional coaches in the area of Math, ELA and Science target specific groups with both remediation and enrichment strategies. Additionally, all students have access to digital literacy instruction, which reinforces different content areas with the use of technology.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The school's Title I department collaborates with the community outreach team to drive several parental involvement programs. In addition to the allowable allocation from the Title I funds, the school supports the successful Parent 2 Parent program. Therefore, more than 90% of Title I funds are allocated to the instructional programs.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No