Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Academir Charter School East At Doral School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Academir Charter School East At Doral

11300 NW 41ST STREET, Doral, FL 33178

www.academircharterterschooleast.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 East at Doral is to provide students with a well-rounded elementary 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 East at Doral 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
Ortega, Rosali	Principal	The role of the Principal is to communicate a clear and common vision and mission, and ensures all teachers and staff are implementing the School Improvement Plan 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, and develops partnerships.
Cabrera, Erlan	Instructional Coach	The role of the coach is to provide classroom support and guidance to teachers to improve instruction quality. The instructional coach engages in collaborative planning meetings to ensure data based instruction is taking place. The coach also provides assistance when implementing the Math and Science curriculum and standards.
Green, Shannon	Instructional Coach	The role of the coach is to provide classroom support and guidance to teachers to improve instruction quality. The instructional coach engages in collaborative planning meetings to ensure data based instruction is taking place. The coach also provides assistance when implementing the ELA curriculum and standards.
March, Mary	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 programs as set forth by the school principal. The Assistant Principal collaborates with the school Leadership Team to provide direction 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 intervention. It is also part of the Assistant Principal duties to evaluate the progress of the school improvement program and of staff needed to initiate the required improvement.

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 all school decisions by being invited to all school meetings in a timely manner, held at different times of day to make attendance more feasible for a variety of families. The school has a School Advisory Council which includes the leadership team, teachers and staff, families and community leaders.

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 School Improvement Plan will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on student achievement through classroom walk-throughs, student progress monitoring, common planning, and feedback from the Student Advisory Council.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	98%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	33%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B
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	1	34	14	12	4	3	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	5
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	2	0	7	12	0	0	0	0	22
	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	1	2	1	4	3	2	0	0	0	13

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	13	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	9	0	0	0	21
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	
	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	5	0	0	0	0	5

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	13	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	9	0	0	0	21
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	
	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	5	0	0	0	0	5

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
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*	57	60	53	55	62	56			
ELA Learning Gains				57					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43					
Math Achievement*	69	66	59	63	58	50			
Math Learning Gains				66					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65					
Science Achievement*	50	58	54	53	64	59			
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	69	63	59	66					

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	303
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	468
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				
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	60			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	54			

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	57			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	59			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	53			

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	57			69			50					69
SWD												
ELL	50			66			44				5	69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	56			69			49				5	69
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	59			61			41				5	62

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	55	57	43	63	66	65	53					66
SWD												
ELL	51	57	42	63	70	71	38					66
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	55	56	40	65	69	68	51					66
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	51	48	25	63	57	55	55					67

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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	57%	56%	1%	54%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	58%	11%	58%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	55%	52%	3%	50%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	73%	63%	10%	59%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	83%	64%	19%	61%	22%
05	2023 - Spring	69%	58%	11%	55%	14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	50%	-4%	51%	-5%

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.

Our lowest performance overall was in English Language Arts with a 60% proficiency due to a large ESOL population.

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

Science performance declined by 1 percentage point from the 2021-2022 school year to the 2022-2023 school year. The lack of growth was due to staffing.

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.

In comparison to the state average, our ELA proficiency was higher by 10 percentage points, our Math proficiency was higher by 19 percentage points, and our Science proficiency was lower by 1 percentage point. Effective teachers and support from two full-time instructional coaches contributed to our success.

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

Our overall math proficiency increased by 11 percentage points (from 64% in 2021-2022 to 75% in 2022-2023). We attribute this success to increased fidelity of differentiated instruction and increasing teacher capacity.

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

As per our Early Warning Indicators, we would like to monitor student attendance and it's negative impact on student achievement.

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year are 1. ELA overall proficiency, 2. Math Proficiency. 3. Culture and Environment - Student Attendance.

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

#1. 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.

When the state assessments data was analyzed the major performance gaps found were relate to the ELA component. The scores in the Reading and Writing state assessments were the lowest when compared with the other subject areas. The high number of ELL students also indicates that there might be a language barrier that needs extra support. That is why the major area of intervention and where a big part of our efforts are going to
take place belong to ELA.

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

The leadership team will provide extra support and resources towards Language arts instruction. The main purpose for this plan is to increase ELA student achievement and Learning gains. The main outcome is to increase student proficiency in ELA from the last year's PM3 proficiency score of 60% to 70% in the PM3 of the 2023-2024 FAST CAI assessment.

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

The instructional coach will be working closely with each ELA teacher s to monitor implementation of rigorous instruction and differentiated instruction. FAST (PM1, PM2) and I-Ready (AP1, AP2) assessments will be monitored to assess student progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shannon Green (green@academircharterschooleast.com)

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

The Reading Wonders Core Curriculum and WonderWorks (pull-out) intervention curriculum will be used for reading instruction. Teachers will use the assessment component of each of these resources to monitor student progress. Additional tutoring will be provided after school to enhance learning for select students. Teachers will focus on evidence-based reading strategies such as the use of word maps, graphic organizers, and story sequencing.

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

The above-mentioned strategies are effective for students that are learning English as a second language. Focusing on these strategies will lead to an increase in overall student comprehension of texts in Reading, which in turn will also support them in their comprehension of Mathematics problems and Science questions.

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.

Professional development on the use of word maps and story sequencing and the effective implementation into their daily instructional routine have taken place. During weekly common planning, teachers are provided with resources to be used in vocabulary and reading comprehension with their ELA curriculum and discussions on how to use these resources to correlate and how to use supplemental ELL and reteach resources for ELL students and struggling readers. Teachers are supported to plan for effective data-driven differentiated instruction on a weekly basis with coaches and with all ELA teachers. In addition, school-wide ELA tutoring is offered to the lowest 25% of students, twice a week from October-April. In addition, teachers will receive ongoing professional development in the areas indicated by our needs assessment and best practices for effective reading instruction.

Person Responsible: Shannon Green (green@academircharterschooleast.com)

By When: Ongoing

#2. 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 data retrieved from the FAST CAI assessments, there was an overall proficiency of 75%. It is a crucial need for our school, as we desire to continuously improve and maintain/obtain high performing status.

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

The leadership team will provide extra support and resources towards mathematics instruction. The main outcome is to increase student proficiency in Mathematics from the 75% scored in 2022-2023 to at least 80% in the PM3 of the FAST CAI assessment.

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

The leadership team will provide extra support and resources towards mathematics instruction. The main outcome is to increase student proficiency in Mathematics from the 75% scored in 2022-2023 to at least 80% in the PM3 of the FAST CAI assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erlan Cabrera (952889@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.)

The evidence-based strategies that will be evident in Mathematics instruction are: 1. The use of district Topic Assessments to assess and monitor student mastery of standards, allowing this data to drive instruction. 2. Students are supported through interventions weekly. 3. The use of i-Ready toolbox and Big Ideas re-teach specific standard-driven instruction is provided to the students to meet their individual educational needs. 4. After-school tutoring for the lowest 25% will be implemented.

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

In order to increase math proficiency, the school instructional coaches will help build the instructional capacity of math teachers through professional development, coaching cycles and common planning. In addition, in order to reinforce strategies and increase mathematics proficiency the school will develop curriculum maps
and crunch calendars to reinforce strategies. The school will offer daily interventions for tier 2 and tier 3 students in the RTI process to support and target the needs of struggling students through a systematic research based instructional approach. Afternoon tutoring opportunities are also available to students in the lowest 25% in need of reinforcement of skills. Third though Fifth grade students are encouraged to participate in these weekly sessions.

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.

Teachers will receive professional development on the standards and the use of the Big Ideas curriculum, resources to be used alongside the Big Ideas curriculum, common planning sessions to discuss the use of resources and plan for effective data-driven differentiated instruction, and the implementation of school-wide Math tutoring offered to the lowest 25% of students, twice a week from October-April. In addition, teachers will receive ongoing professional development in the areas indicated by our needs assessment and best practices for effective math instruction.

Person Responsible: Erlan Cabrera (952889@dadeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

#3. 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.

After reviewing the Early Warning System Indicators report, it was identified that 14% of our students are missing school for 10% or more of the school days in a school year.

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

Our goal is to lower the amount of students with excessive absences (10% or more of the school days) from 14% to 5%.

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

The school counselor will implement an incentive program to recognize homerooms with perfect attendance on a daily basis. We will follow the district policies regarding truancy for students with excessive absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary March (march@academircharterschooleast.com)

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

The school counselor will retrieve attendance reports daily in order to communicate with parents in a timely manner to be proactive with students accumulating excessive absences.

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

Effective communication and working with the student support team will ensure success with student attendance.

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.

The school counselor will plan, promote, and implement an incentive program for homeroom attendance. She will then communicate with parents in a timely manner for students accumulating excessive absences.

Person Responsible: Mary March (march@academircharterschooleast.com)

By When: Ongoing

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No