Academir Charter School West School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Academir Charter School West

14880 SW 26TH ST, Miami, FL 33185

www.academircharterschoolwest.com

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.

The mission of AcadeMir Charter School West is to provide students with a well-rounded K-8 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 for AcadeMir Charter School West 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, 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
Bello, Susie	Principal	The role of the Principal is to communicate a clear and common vision and mission, oversee day to day operations, and ensure that all teachers and staff are implementing the SIP and following the problem solving process. The principal assures instruction is aligned to state academic content standards, maintains continuous improvement in the building, designs instruction for student success, develops partnerships with parents and the community, and nurtures a positive school culture that promotes learning and engagement for students and adults and where each individual feels valued.
Rodriguez, Tracy	Assistant Principal	The role of the Assistant Principal is to assist in the development, establishment, and implementation of the goals and objectives of the school instructional program as set forth by the school principal. The Assistant Principal collaborates with the School Leadership Team to provide direction to staff in the implementing of goals and objectives and professional development. The Assistant Principal analyzes and disseminates information related to student data and progress, and evaluates the impact of instruction and interventions in Tiers 1-3; as well as, evaluates the progress of the school improvement program and of staff and assists to initiate needed improvement.
Valladares, Melissa	Assistant Principal	The role of the PLC Assistant Principal is to assist in the development, establishment, and implementation of the goals and objectives of the school instructional program as set forth by the school principal. The Assistant Principal collaborates with the School Leadership Team to provide direction to staff in the implementing of goals and objectives and professional development. The Assistant Principal analyzes and disseminates information related to student data and progress. Ms. Valladares is also the Science Curriculum Lead and ESOL Coordinator. The role of Curriculum Support Specialists provide classroom support and guidance to teachers on the implementation of the SIP. She engages in collaborative planning meetings with Science teachers to ensure data is driving instructional decisions and monitors program effectiveness by reviewing data results from iReady, baseline, topic assessments and Mid-Year Assessments, as well as student progress motioning through science enrichment. She also assist teachers in implementing of the instructional core and supplemental programs with fidelity. Ms. Valladares also provides

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		support services through coaching cycles, professional development and instructional coaching to in an effort to build their instruction capacity and increase student achievement in Science and STREAM education. Additionally, Ms. Valladares monitors and supports the ESOL program at the school by supporting the monitoring the school-wide ESOL program by facilitating ESOL Testing, holding Annual LEP Committee meetings, providing teachers with ESOL strategies and resources, offer professional development for proper implementation of ESOL Strategies and techniques to support all ELL learners in the general education classroom.
Hernandez, Lisa	Instructional Coach	The role of Mathematics Instructional Coach/Curriculum Support Specialist is to provide classroom support and guidance to teachers on the implementation of the SIP. She engages in collaborative planning meetings with Mathematics teachers to ensure data is driving instructional decisions and monitors program effectiveness by reviewing data results from FAST PM1 and PM2, iReady AP1, and Mid-Year AP2 Assessments, as well as student progress motioning. She also assist teachers in implementing of the instructional core and supplemental programs with fidelity. She also provides support services through coaching cycles, professional development and instructional coaching to in an effort to build the instruction capacity of teachers and helps to increase student achievement in Mathematics.
Fonseca, Cindy	Instructional Coach	The role of ELA Instructional Coach/Curriculum Support Specialist is to provide classroom support and guidance to teachers on the implementation of the SIP. She engages in collaborative planning meetings with ELA teachers to ensure data is driving instructional decisions and monitors program effectiveness by reviewing data results from FAST PM1 and PM2, iReady AP1, and Mid-Year AP2 Assessments, as well as student progress motioning. She also assist teachers in implementing of the instructional core and supplemental programs with fidelity. She also provides support services through coaching cycles, professional development and instructional coaching to in an effort to build the instruction capacity of teachers and helps to increase student achievement in English Language Arts.

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.

Involving stakeholders in the School Improvement Plan development process is a comprehensive and collaborative endeavor. It begins by identifying key stakeholder groups, which encompass the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students and families, and business or community leaders. To initiate the process, an initial communication effort is undertaken to convey the significance and objectives of the SIP development. The formation of a SIP development team, consisting of representatives from each stakeholder group, ensures diverse perspectives are brought to the table. A crucial step involves conducting a thorough stakeholder analysis to comprehend each group's interests, concerns, and expectations. This insight informs the subsequent collection of input from stakeholders through various means such as surveys and meetings. Teachers and staff provide observations and suggestions related to school improvement, parents contribute their priorities and expectations, and students and families share their perspectives. Engaging with business or community leaders explores potential avenues of support.
The gathered input is meticulously analyzed to identify common themes and emerging priorities. This collaborative process culminates in the establishment of clear, measurable goals and objectives, collaboratively defined by all stakeholder groups. The development of strategies and action plans follows, with responsibilities and timelines assigned for implementation. Iterative feedback loops with stakeholders ensure that the SIP remains inclusive and responsive. After revisions, the SIP document is finalized to accurately represent the collective vision and input of all stakeholders. Implementation and monitoring begin, and regular updates and reviews, with continued stakeholder engagement, maintain the plan's relevance and alignment with evolving school needs. Throughout the process, open communication and transparency are upheld, with stakeholders regularly informed of progress and adjustments. The active involvement of stakeholders ensures that the SIP reflects a collective commitment to improving the school and its outcomes.

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))

Monitoring the School Improvement Plan (SIP) stands as a critical pillar in the broader framework of the school's improvement journey. This oversight ensures that ACSW stays on course towards its goals and possesses the flexibility to adapt as circumstances dictate. By implementing a methodical and data-centered approach to SIP oversight, the school remains agile in addressing evolving challenges and needs. The processes employed to keep a vigilant eye on the SIP, the cadence of data sharing, and the criteria guiding course adjustments are as follows: Firstly, the school's leadership team, alongside instructional leaders, regularly conducts classroom walkthroughs. This practice allows for the observation of teaching methods, the level of student engagement, and the alignment of instructional practices with the SIP's objectives. Secondly, teachers engage in continuous student progress monitoring, using formative and summative assessments that align with the SIP's core objectives. Data pertaining to student performance undergoes collection and analysis on a quarterly basis.
Thirdly, the practice of weekly common planning with teachers and instructional coaches becomes a recurrent fixture. During these sessions, the Academic Coaching Support Team delves into the SIP's progress, sharing valuable insights and strategies. Through surveys and periodic meetings the school administration actively seeks input from teachers and staff. They gather perspectives on the efficacy of

SIP strategies and valuable suggestions for improvements. These feedback sessions convene once each semester. Furthermore, the school engages parents and community members through a series of regular meetings, surveys, or participation in the Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC). This engagement serves to capture their unique perspectives and insights on the school's ongoing efforts to improve. These interactions are held quarterly.

Regarding the frequency of data sharing and discussions with the leadership team, these occur on a weekly basis. Data stemming from classroom walkthroughs, student progress assessments, staff feedback, and input from parents and the community are made available to the school's leadership team on a monthly cadence.

Critical to the process, the leadership team employs a data-informed decision-making approach. They meticulously analyze data to discern trends and patterns, shaping their decisions based on the evidence of what is or isn't working.

Prior to enacting significant changes to the SIP, the school actively involves pertinent stakeholders in the decision-making process. Their input and feedback on proposed alterations are thoughtfully considered, reinforcing a collaborative approach to improvement.

A regular SIP review process is maintained in conjunction with the leadership team. These reviews serve as opportunities to assess progress, delve into data-driven discussions, and make informed decisions regarding necessary adjustments. The frequency of these meetings aligns with the rhythm of data collection and sharing.

Finally, the school nurtures a culture of continuous improvement, instilling within all stakeholders a shared understanding of the imperative to adapt and refine the SIP continually.

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)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	98%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	48%
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	17	12	0	7	0	5	4	7	0	52
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	5
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	20	9	5	2	7	8	5	0	56
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	7	6	8	5	8	9	1	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	16	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	1	12	15	7	7	3	8	10	8	71

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	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	6	15	1	7	15	10	14	0	68

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	6	15	1	7	15	10	14	0	68

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
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*	75	61	53	82	62	55	80		
ELA Learning Gains				68			68		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			58		
Math Achievement*	73	63	55	83	51	42	77		
Math Learning Gains				69			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61			52		
Science Achievement*	75	56	52	82	60	54	80		
Social Studies Achievement*	94	77	68		68	59			
Middle School Acceleration		75	70		61	51			
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	48	62	55	61	75	70	83		

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	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	443
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	560
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	24	Yes	2	1
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	74			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

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%
FRL	69			

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	36	Yes	1	
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	70			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	67			

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	75			73			75	94				48
SWD	27			20							2	
ELL	64			62			65				5	48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	75			72			77	94			6	48
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	70			62			72	89			6	52

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	82	68	54	83	69	61	82					61
SWD	36			36								
ELL	75	67	56	74	63	59	67					61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	82	69	56	83	69	59	81					61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	79	69	55	79	63	54	81					59

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	80	68	58	77	46	52	80					83
SWD	30			40								
ELL	68	64		69	56	50	84					83
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	80	69	58	77	47	52	80					83
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	76	61	47	71	39	33	72					80

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	83%	56%	27%	54%	29%
07	2023 - Spring	73%	50%	23%	47%	26%
04	2023 - Spring	89%	58%	31%	58%	31%
06	2023 - Spring	56%	50%	6%	47%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	76%	52%	24%	50%	26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	56%	58%	-2%	54%	2%
07	2023 - Spring	72%	48%	24%	48%	24%
03	2023 - Spring	70%	63%	7%	59%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	84%	64%	20%	61%	23%
05	2023 - Spring	79%	58%	21%	55%	24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	76%	50%	26%	51%	25%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	56%	33%	50%	39%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	68%	27%	66%	29%

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 component that showed the lowest performance was sixth grade math. Contributing factors to last year's low performance include, but not limited to, staff changes, new curriculum platforms, new textbooks, standards, and testing formats. Additionally, the transition from elementary curriculum to middle school curriculum often causes trending dips in achievement as students learn to maneuver new routines and environments.

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

The component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was 6th grade ELA. The factors that contributed to this decline include, but not limited to, staff limitations, delivery of consistent instruction, and implementation of new testing formats and platforms that did not mirror testing platforms from prior years.

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.

When compared to the state average, the data component that had the greatest gap was sixth grade math with a 1% difference. The factors that contributed to this gap in performance include, but not limited to, staff changes, new curriculum platforms, new textbooks, standards, and testing formats. Additionally, the transition from elementary curriculum to middle school curriculum often causes trending dips in achievement as students learn to maneuver new routines and environments.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is 4th grade ELA with an 11% increase. New actions that were implemented include, but not limited to, continuous novel study and more inclusion of digital testing platforms to simulate newly implemented testing requirements.

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

Reflecting on the data from EWS in part I, two areas of potential concern would be attendance and ELA scores in grade 1.

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

1. ELA
2. Middle School Mathematics
3. Attendance

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 Early Warning System

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.

To provide the best learning environment, AcadeMir uses a Positive Behavior System that includes proactive strategies for defining, teaching, and supporting appropriate student behaviors to create positive school environments where students feel safe and respected. The goal is to create a social culture in our school building that will encourage positive behaviors and interactions, while discouraging problem behaviors.

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

This will decrease the percentage of students that are absent for 10% or more of the school year from 7% to 5%.

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

ACSW ensures that the social-emotional needs of all students are being met through the collaboration of administration, teachers, school lead counselor, students, and parents. AcadeMir provides support that are tailored to the student's specific needs and circumstances, include interventions that address needs in different areas of a student's life and involve a comprehensive approach to understanding the behaviors.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Valladares (926448@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.)

ACSW implements the 3R's Plus Club – Respect, Responsibility, Readiness Ready to Learn, and Integrity plus School Values and the Values Matter MDCPS Curriculum as a guideline to all students for
the behaviors expected at school. Students take the 3R's Plus Pledge which is promise that the student will always strive toward reaching the positive behavior expectations of our school. The values are presented through our morning announcements and are encouraged to participate in our school-wide activity for each value which is presented on the PBS bulletin board. Throughout the month students receive Tiger Bucks to be used during our monthly Tiger Store and Tiger Social. After continuous teaching of behavioral expectations students are rewarded in order to establish a school environment where appropriate and positive behavior is the norm.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The positive behavior matrix is organized to promote successful behavior from all students. Faculty and staff share the responsibility of ensuring that all students follow the school's discipline plan and increase the student's adaptive skills and opportunities for an enhanced quality of life.

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. 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.

Upon dissegregating the data it became evident that the need was to further provide support in the ESSA subgroup specifically related to students with disabilities and increase learning gains and proficiency in this area of focus.

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

In the year of 2022-2023 learning gains were not calculated due to the new BEST standards and state assessment requirements. Now during the 2021-2022 school year, ACSW attained a 54% in learning gains in the lowest 25% in ELA. With specific standard and data driven instruction in class and after school tutoring ACSW will increase L25 learning gains to 56% in ELA.

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

Progress monitoring data helps us monitor student performance by subgroups such as , ESE, ESOL and lowest
25% so that we may increase or adjust tutoring, interventions and/or enrichment for students. School instructional leadership team will ensure that teachers are implementing the goals outlined in the School Improvement Plan with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cindy Fonseca (947747@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.)

Afternoon tutoring opportunities are available to students in the lowest 25% in need of reinforcement of skills. Second through eighth grade students are encouraged to participate in these weekly sessions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The ACSW Curriculum Coaches, provide classroom support and guidance to teachers on
the implementation process of School Improvement Plan. They assist teachers with Tier
grouping decisions based on data results. They engages in data chats with all teachers to
ensure data is driving instructional decisions and monitors program effectiveness by
reviewing data results from FAST progress monitoring, iReady diagnostic assessments, baseline, topic assessments,
and growth monitoring assessments.They are responsible for disseminating information to grade level teachers discussed during Leadership Team
Meetings, assist teachers in the implementation of School Improvement Plan, meet on a
weekly basis with grade level teachers to discuss data results, differentiated instruction,
group interventions, and self-monitoring by students.

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

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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).

Goals and areas of focus are reviewed to determine if ADDITIONAL funding is needed to support the goals. This is done within leadership meetings and discussions with EESAC throughout the 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

All grade levels score above 70% in proficiency in ELA.

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

Students who are considered the lowest 25% learners scored a 54% in Learning Gains in 2022. In 2023, this subgroups' data was not collected as it was a baseline year for FAST, and no learning gains were counted. After-School tutoring is offered to our students. Intervention for Tiers 1, 2, and 3 are embedded thoughout the school day and are consistently being monitored for progress. Students in need of specialized instruction (IEP) in ELA are receiving additional support to ensure individualized needs are met in order to close reading deficiencies.

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

Proficiency rates in grades K-2 are targeted at 70% or higher.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Proficiency rates in grades 3-8 are targeted at 70% or higher.

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.

Monitoring is biweekly either through standards based assessments or a review of intervention/ tutoring data.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Fonseca, Cindy, fonseca@academircharterschoolwest.com

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?

All programs at ACSW meet or accept the FLDOE definition for evidence-based practices, align to the Florida
B.E.S.T. standards, and are comprehensive in the implementation of our reading plan outcomes.

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?

All programs at ACSW meet or accept the FLDOE definition for evidence-based practices, align to the Florida B.E.S.T. standards and are comprehensive in the implementation of our reading plan outcomes. The target population of SWD's and the lowest 25% learners respond to a variety of consistent strategies and individualized learning outcomes. ACSW utilizes a variety of resources to accomplish different learning modalities such as Wonders, My Perspectives, iReady, Performance Matters, Common Lit, Novel Studies, Cross-Curricular Instruction, and Performance Coach.

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
Assessment: All assessments are reviewed for their alignment to Florida B.E.S.T. standards and focus calendars to ensure that students are continuously being monitored for standards mastery.	Rodriguez, Tracy, trodriguez@charterschoolatwaterstone.com
Literacy Coaching	Fonseca, Cindy, 947747@dadeschools.net
Professional Learning	Fonseca, Cindy, fonseca@academircharterschoolwest.com
Literacy Leadership	Bello, Susie, susiebello@dadeschools.net

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: Early Warning System				$3,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0410 - Academir Charter School West	Other	727.0	$3,500.00
			Notes: PBS Incentives to decrease student attendance percentages throughout the school year.			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	0410 - Academir Charter School West	School Improvement Funds	727.0	$1,000.00
			Notes: School Improvement Funds will be utilized to pay for free after school tutoring in ELA for students in grades 2nd - 8th.			

	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	0410 - Academir Charter School West	School Improvement Funds	727.0	$1,000.00
			Notes: School Improvement Funds will be utilized to pay for free after school tutoring in Mathematics for students in grades 2nd - 8th.			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:				$0.00
					Total:	$5,500.00

Budget Approval

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

No