

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Academir Charter School Of Math And Science School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 11 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 20 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 20 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 23 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 24 |

Academir Charter School Of Math And Science

13330 SW 288TH STREET, Homestead, FL 33030

www.academirpreparatoryacademy.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 Shool of Math and Science is to provide students with a well-rounded elementary 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 of Math and Science 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 |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Cejas, Antonio | 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 all stakeholders feel valued. |
| Moreira Taylor, Liza | 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. |
| Roque, Nancy | 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 monitoring. 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 datacentered 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 (Continuous Improvement)

Demographic Data

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 98% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 71% |
| 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) | 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: 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 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 75 | 73 | 61 | 28 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 284 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 74 | 73 | 43 | 11 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 229 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | |
| | 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 | 75 | 73 | 61 | 28 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 284 |

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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| 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 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | |
| 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 | 9 | 12 | 8 | 15 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| 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 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | |
| 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 | 9 | 12 | 8 | 15 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 1 | 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* | 44 | | | 43 | 62 | 56 | 40 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 57 | 69 | 61 | 44 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 47 | 60 | 52 | | | |
| Math Achievement* | 51 | | | 64 | 64 | 60 | 67 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 79 | 71 | 64 | 63 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 69 | 66 | 55 | | | |
| Science Achievement* | 52 | | | 50 | 53 | 51 | 33 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 0 | 50 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | | | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | | | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | | | | |
| ELP Progress | 58 | | | 55 | | | 61 | | |

** 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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 54 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 272 |
| 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 | 58 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 464 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| 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 | 40 | Yes | 1 | |
| ELL | 49 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 54 | | | |
| 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 | 43 | | | |
| ELL | 52 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 56 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 58 | | | |

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 | 44 | | | 51 | | | 52 | | | | | 58 |
| SWD | 29 | | | 48 | | | | | | | 3 | 42 |
| ELL | 34 | | | 46 | | | 42 | | | | 5 | 58 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 44 | | | 49 | | | 49 | | | | 5 | 58 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | | | 51 | | | 47 | | | | 5 | 57 |

| 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 | 43 | 57 | 47 | 64 | 79 | 69 | 50 | | | | | 55 |
| SWD | 11 | 42 | | 28 | 75 | | | | | | | 60 |
| ELL | 32 | 54 | 50 | 54 | 75 | 64 | 33 | | | | | 55 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 41 | 56 | 43 | 61 | 79 | 67 | 48 | | | | | 54 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 42 | 58 | 50 | 63 | 79 | 67 | 50 | | | | | 53 |

| 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 | 40 | 44 | | 67 | 63 | | 33 | | | | | 61 |
| SWD | 15 | | | 50 | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 32 | 36 | | 63 | 64 | | 40 | | | | | 61 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 41 | 44 | | 67 | 63 | | 33 | | | | | 61 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 39 | 40 | | 67 | 60 | | 29 | | | | | 61 |

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 | 44% | 56% | -12% | 54% | -10% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 22% | 58% | -36% | 58% | -36% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 64% | 52% | 12% | 50% | 14% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 67% | 63% | 4% | 59% | 8% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 26% | 64% | -38% | 61% | -35% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 58% | 58% | 0% | 55% | 3% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 47% | 50% | -3% | 51% | -4% |

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.

ELA achievement for third-fifth grade is the lowest performance proficiency at 43%. While third grade outperformed both the state and district averages, fourth and fifth grade fell below those averages. Fourth grade proficiency was 22% and fifth grade proficiency was 44%. The main contributing factor was a lack of availability of state certified (in-field) classroom teachers.

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

The percent proficiency for third-fifth grade math achievement demonstrated the greatest decline from a 64% proficiency to a 50% proficiency. The main contributing factor was a lack of availability of state certified (in-field) classroom teachers.

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 third-fifth grade ELA proficiency percentage has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. One contributing factor was a large influx of migrant students with limited-to-no English

language proficiency. Another contributing factor was a lack of availability of state certified (in-field) classroom teachers.

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

None of the data component showed improvement when comparing proficiency scores from Spring 2022 to 2023.

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

Fourth Grade Math and ELA proficiency, and schoolwide ELA & Science proficiency.

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

1. ELA
2. 5th Grade Science
3. Improve Truancy 2nd-5th Grade

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.

Based on the 2023 FAST data for ELA, the school will implement differentiation as our area of focus. We have selected this area because the FAST data showed that 56% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in ELA as compared to 61% on the 2022 FSA. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of a high number of ESOL level 1 students and large class sizes, we will implement, with fidelity, differentiated instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement differentiated instruction, we expect our proficiency on the FAST ELA to increase by 10 percentage points in grades 3-5 as demonstrated on the 2024 FAST.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will conduct quarterly data chats and instructional reviews, adjust groups based on current data, provide interventions for students in the lowest 25% and 35%, and follow up with regular walkthroughs to ensure differentiated instruction is being implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Liza Morera Taylor (932229@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.)

Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of: acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability. Research demonstrates this method benefits a wide range of students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiated Instruction will ensure that teachers are using relevant and timely data to plan lessons that are differentiated to meet student needs. Teachers will continually provide feedback to students and make adjustments to instructional delivery and the grouping of students for remediation as the data becomes available.

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.

Based on our data review, our school will focus on Instructional Practice/Support Facilitation, related to student IEP goals, leading to increased learning gains. This was selected because students with disabilities are not making adequate academic progress through learning gain.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The subgroup Students With Disabilities (SWD) will increase learning gains by 3 points by the end of the 2023-2024 school year

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through weekly classroom walk throughs (teacher effectiveness), NWEA data 2 times per year and FAST/STAR progress monitoring 2 times per year. Encourage more teachers to seek ESE certifications and or endorsements.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Liza Morera Taylor (932229@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.)

i-ready and FAST will be used one strategy introduced each onth to increase student achievement. This are part of the AVID system we are implementing for the first time this year. We will also be implementing the Marzano High Yield instructional strategy of higher order questioning and collaboration through think pair share.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The specific learning strategies noted are being used to increase academic rigor and student achievement. The goal is to promote learning gains and proficiency across grade levels and within the SWD subgroup

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)).

N/A

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

Increase coaching cycle to improve Instructional Delivery. Increase in Data chats between Student and Teacher, Teacher and Reading Coach, Reading Coach and Administration. Implement Tier 2 Interventions by Classroom Teacher utilizing i-Ready Teacher Toolbox Curriculum. Implement Tier 3 Interventions utilizing Compass Coach curriculum, with fidelity.

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

Increase coaching cycle to improve Instructional Delivery. Increase in Data chats between Student and Teacher, Teacher and Reading Coach, Reading Coach and Administration. Implement Tier 2 Interventions by Classroom Teacher utilizing i-Ready Teacher Toolbox Curriculum. Implement Tier 3 Interventions utilizing Compass Coach curriculum, with fidelity.

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

Increase student reading and math proficiency by 15% in each grade-level (k-2) by Spring 2024.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Increase student overall reading proficiency by 15%, and math overall proficiency by 12% by Spring 2024.

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.

Academir Charter School of Math and Science ensures that the social-emotional needs of all students are being met through the collaboration of administration, teachers, school 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. (PBS School)

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Cejas, Antonio, acejas@dadeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

ACSMS; i-Ready Teacher Tool Box, i-Ready , MDCPS Standards Mastery Performance, Visual Kids Learning (VKL) Science. In addition, 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:

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?

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. i-Ready Standards Mastery and Teacher toolBox Engages all students of all levels and backgrounds . it also motivates students to persist in skill building and provides scaffolded support that meets the needs of all students creating personal learning pathways for each student.

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 |
|--|--|
| Literacy Coach will be monitoring 5 teachers weekly, after observation by the Principal and Assistant Principal. The Coaching Cycle will be implemented, (Pre-conference, Observe, Debrief, Model, Debrief, Teach, Debrief, Reflect) based on teachers' needs. Literacy Coach will monitor data from assessments and determine which students are in need of additional interventions and/or services. Literacy Coach will provide Professional Development based on observations from Coaching Cycle. | Roque, nancy , 931704@dadeschools.net |
| Administrative observations to identify instructional areas of need to increase student achievement. Facilitate instructional coaching cycles and debrief with the instructional coach on a weekly basis. | Cejas, Antonio, acejas@dadeschools.net |
| Grade level and teacher individual data meetings to monitor student progress and plan intervention strategies. (9 weeks Cycles) | Morera Taylor, Liza, 932229@dadeschools.net |

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.

A copy of the SIP will be made available for all stakeholders to review in the school lobby. Another copy will be placed in the ACSMS Parent Resource Center. Once the SIP is reviewed and finalized a current copy will be added on to the school website.

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 will host multiple events and invite all parents to participate. In addition, Academir will host Parental WorkShops. Literacy Night, Test Readiness and Social and Emotional Well-Being

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)

Interventions and remediations will be integrated in the daily schedule. In addition, the school will use Title I funding to hire instructional coaches to improve teacher performance. Tutoring will be made available for all students identified as low performers.

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))

N/A

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))

NA

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))

NA

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).

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |

Budget Approval

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

No