Miami Community Charter High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Miami Community Charter High School

18720 SW 352ND ST, Florida City, FL 33034

www.mccedu.org

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
Papili, Stephany	Principal	
Marquez, Abinel	School Counselor	
Rezaie, Jila	Other	
Plaza , Arasalis	Dean	
Barrios, Andrea	Math Coach	
Mejia, Raquel	Assistant Principal	
Mitchell, Michelle	Reading Coach	
Qureshi, Wajida	Instructional Coach	
Rodriguez, Lianet	Instructional Coach	
Saaveddra, Ruben	Instructional Technology	
Hazelton, Caroline	ELL Compliance Specialist	

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.

All stakeholders are involved in the SIP Development. Administration team meets with the Instructional Leaders and Student Services Department on an ongoing basis to discuss academic and social emotional progress including goal setting and problem solving. Instructional Leaders then meet with their team teachers to discuss and analyze the goals and plan of action. Progress Monitoring Assessments are conducted and implemented through Student Data Chats so all students and parents are aware of the progress. The school Administration team keeps the Governing Board informed through Academic Reports in the Board Meetings.

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 is a live document which is a part of every Professional Learning Community meeting. Instructional Leaders are responsible to progress monitor and revisit the goal(s) and plan of action accordingly. Revisions and modifications are made as needed.

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	99%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	78%
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)	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	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
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	133

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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*	30	55	50	32	54	51	32		
ELA Learning Gains				42			32		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31			28		
Math Achievement*	15	43	38	9	42	38	8		
Math Learning Gains				23			21		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35			40		
Science Achievement*	39	62	64	38	41	40	27		
Social Studies Achievement*	62	69	66	49	56	48	41		
Middle School Acceleration					56	44			
Graduation Rate	83	89	89	94	56	61	91		
College and Career Acceleration	79	70	65	74	67	67	75		
ELP Progress	23	49	45	47			32		

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	331
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	83

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	474
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	94

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				
ELL	40	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	48			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	48			

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				
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	10	Yes	1	1
HSP	43			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	44			

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	30			15			39	62		83	79	23
SWD												
ELL	13			18			41	36		79	7	23
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	29			15			38	65		83	7	22
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	29			18			41	65		79	7	23

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	32	42	31	9	23	35	38	49		94	74	47
SWD												
ELL	10	38	32	7	20		28	16		84	94	47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	9			10								
HSP	35	43	31	9	23	36	40	48		93	74	45
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	33	43	33	9	23	35	41	49		94	77	47

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	32	32	28	8	21	40	27	41		91	75	32
SWD												
ELL	14	28	27	6	20		33	21		82	78	32
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	33	32	24	9	20	33	31	43		90	74	33
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	32	32	28	8	21	40	27	41		94	79	32

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
10	2023 - Spring	38%	54%	-16%	50%	-12%
09	2023 - Spring	20%	51%	-31%	48%	-28%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	18%	56%	-38%	50%	-32%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	10%	52%	-42%	48%	-38%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	39%	65%	-26%	63%	-24%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	61%	66%	-5%	63%	-2%

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 lowest performance data component is in the area of Mathematics including Algebra 1 at 16% proficiency and Geometry at 14% proficiency. Some contributing factors to last year's low performance includes English Language Acquisition, fluency, and vocabulary, large classes, and low student motivation and engagement.

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

The data component with the greatest decline from the prior year is English Language Arts. Some contributing factors to this decline includes below grade level reading/fluency/comprehension/ vocabulary, English Language proficiency/acquisition, sustaining higher order thinking student work, and ELA teacher out due to unexpected medical illness.

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 9th Grade ELA The contributing factors for the gap are below grade level reading/fluency/comprehension/vocabulary, English Language proficiency/acquisition, sustaining higher order thinking student work, and ELA teacher out due to unexpected medical illness.

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

The data component demonstrating the most improvement is U.S.History. Some new actions our school took in this area was ongoing district based assessment progress monitoring and deeper content based reviews and checking for understanding.

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

One area of concern on the EWS is the number of students with 18+ absences (40 students).

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

The highest priority for school improvement in the upcoming school year is meeting all high school graduation requirements, ELA achievement/proficiency, and English Language Learners.

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

#1. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation

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.

Based on the number of retakers (35%), 14 students need to pass the Algebra 1 Assessment to meet the graduation requirement and 8 students need to pass the 10th Grade ELA Assessment to meet the graduation requirement.

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

The school will reduce the number of retakes by 50% by the January 2024 and by 100% by May 2024 by providing Test Prep and SAT tutoring and Assessment opportunities three times a year.

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

This area will be monitored through assessment progress by the school counselor.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Abinel Marquez (amarquez@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.)

All retakers have been assigned to an intervention reading course for reinforcement.

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

Students need a practice and reinforcement in standard based instruction.

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.

Test Prep and SAT tutoring and testing opportunities.

Person Responsible: Abinel Marquez (amarquez@mccsedu.org)

By When: May 2024

#2. 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.

Attendance

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

Student 18+ absences will reduce by 20% from 40 students to 32 students by the end of the school year.

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

Student attendance is monitored by the Dean's office in collaboration with Student Services Department, School Administration, and parent. Parents are notified by black board message, phone calls, and parent meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Arasalis Plaza (aplaza@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.)

Progress monitoring by tier 1 (warning black board message), tier 2 (parent phone call), tier 3 (parent call for intervention plan and documentation).

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

The high number of absences.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

Based on the FAST PM3 Assessment, 28% of current 9th Grade students and 17% of current 10th Grade students are proficient.

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 37% of the current 9th Grade students and 35% of current 10th Grade students proficient based on their 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, Read180, and standard based assessments).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Raquel Mejia (944052@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.)

Students are enrolled in Intensive Reading/Developmental Courses implementing Read180 reading curriculum.

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 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

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

Based on the Spring 2023 EOC Assessment, the school earned 16% proficiency in Algebra 1 and 14% proficiency in Geometry.

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 38% of the students enrolled in Algebra 1 and 20% of students enrolled in Geometry proficient based on the Spring 2024 EOC 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 (district based topic and Mid-Year assessments).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrea Barrios (abarrios1@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.)

Students are placed in intensive course based on their state assessment score. Students will utilize IXL as a progress monitoring tool in between assessment periods.

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

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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 10% of students in the English Language Learner (ELL) Program earned proficiency in their English Language Arts State Spring Assessment.

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 24% of the current 9th Grade ELL students and 9% of current 10th Grade ELL students proficient based on their 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, Read180, and standard based assessments) as well as Imagine Learning for ELL Level 1 students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Caroline Hazelton (chazelton15@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.)

Students are enrolled in Developmental Courses implementing Read180 reading/Imagine Learning curriculum.

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

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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, 10% of the Black students scored proficient in the area of Mathematics and 9% 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 15% of Black students scored proficient in the area of Mathematics and 14% scored 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, Read180, and standard based assessments).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Raquel Mejia (944052@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.)

Students are enrolled in Intensive Reading/Developmental Courses implementing Read180 reading curriculum.

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).

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.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

- Each grade K -3, using the 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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

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.

N/A

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

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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

N/A

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.

The methods for dissemination of this SIP is determined by the school's projected outcome at the end of school year 2023 – 2024. This is the driving force in budget planning, including the Title I allocations, more than 90% of which is dedicated to instructional programs. The annual budget is reviewed and approved by the board of directors in the public meeting. The delivery of instruction, instructional materials, and instructional technology receive the highest portion of the funds. The importance of this matters and methods of the implementations are communicated to the parents via the following;
a. Parent 2 Parent Platform, which is conducted in English and Spanish on regular basis.
b. Board of Directors public meetings
c. School's EESAC meetings, and
d. Individual meeting with the students and parents as needed.
Translation is available in all written and verbal communications.
The progress towards meeting the projected outcomes is monitored and reviewed three times a for appropriate revisions.

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))

The school has an active Title I & Community Outreach Office. The school CIS and all members of this team are available during the school days, after school hours, and occasional weekends. In spite of a great parent's participation in the school's in person and live digital programs, by practicing the open door policy all stakeholders, the parents in particular, are accommodated upon request.

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 has taken notable measures to continue with closing the gap, providing equitable access to academic success. The school days is 60 minutes longer that all other public and

charter schools. In addition to tear around after school tutoring programs, the school's Extended Learning Center, ELC provides on going differentiated instruction for all students during the school day. The education programs continue during the winter, spring and summer academies.

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))

In response to the needs of the community, in accordance with the school vision for making a better community, and in compliance with Federal and state guidelines, the school runs outstanding programs for student's socio, emotional and academic wellbeing. The student services collaborate with academic team, Title I and Community Outreach team, school safety team, and school leadership to pride all necessary services for the students. In addition to the food service and transportation services, the counselors' hotline is open during the school recess time, through collaboration with MAC the college and Prep classes are offered to student, some college courses are also offered in the school, while the school supports the dual enrollment program in MDC. The school has a successful College and Career program through the Microsoft , Digital Design and Accounting Quickbook programs.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

School's student's services is a team of academic counselor, two mental health specialist, and two dean of students. This team provides individual and or group sessions for all students. The team is also available via a hotline during the school recess times. In addition to the school based services, the school works with community based services such as NAMI. Give Back is a national mentorship program, which enables the students to prepare and plan for a productive life after high school.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Mexican American Council, Giveback, and Miami Dade College.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Miami Community Charter School follows the guidelines, plans and programs as delineated in the MDCP-S programs.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

The school offers a multilevel of opportunities for professional development. This aligns with the organizational structure of the academic team, which includes the following
a. Collaborative Team I & II
b. Academic Leadership Team (teacher leaders & instructional coaches)
c. PLC teams (all teachers including groups a & b)
d. Professional Pathway, guiding the instructional team to progress to the next step of professional proficiency
e. School wide PD sessions in and out of the building
The meeting agenda for groups a, b, and c is the same during the school year, based on synergy between all team members to monitor progress and move towards meeting the projected outcome.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

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: Graduation: Graduation					$4,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24	
	Tutoring		7058 - Miami Community Charter High School	General Fund		$4,500.00	
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System					$8,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24	
			7058 - Miami Community Charter High School	General Fund		$8,000.00	
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA					$17,635.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24	
	Curriculum		7058 - Miami Community Charter High School	General Fund		$17,635.00	
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math					$1,421.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24	
	Curriculum		7058 - Miami Community Charter High School			$1,421.00	
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners					$1,500.00

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	curriculum/ tutoring		7058 - Miami Community Charter High School	General Fund		$1,500.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American				$0.00
					Total:	$33,056.00

Budget Approval

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

No