
Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	10
Title I Requirements	11
Budget to Support Goals	12

Mater Grove Academy

2805 SW 32ND AVE, Miami, FL 33133

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	42%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	96%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	A	A	A	A*

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridaCIMS.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our Mission is to provide a loving, caring, and supportive educational environment, where the whole child is developed and a philosophy of respect and high expectations is instilled for all students, parents, teachers, and staff.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Mater we will strive to create a thirst for knowledge in all disciplines of the curriculum and enrich every student with a sense of purpose, a belief in their own efficacy, and a commitment to the common good.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title
Caleo, Sheila	Principal
Toledo, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal
Paz, Raquel	Instructional Coach
Meyer, Jacklyn	Instructional Coach

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Sheila Caleo's role as principal is to provide the school with a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensuring that the school-based team is implementing a multi-tiered system of support, and conducting assessments on the effectiveness of the implementation through observation, documentation, and analysis of data. Additionally, she provides the staff with opportunities for professional development and communicates with all stakeholders regarding the school's goals and objectives, and the plans put in place to achieve those desirable outcomes. Elizabeth Toledo provides the data for the principal and instructional coaches in order to facilitate data chats with the teachers. The assistant principal also seeks to find the instructional programs and classroom materials that will best address the needs of learners in an effort to help close learning gaps. The instructional coaches support the school goals by meeting with teachers to discuss their student data and identify trends that should be addressed. They provide instructional support to the teachers through collaborative lesson planning, modeling, and guiding the selection process for small group instruction. Instructional coaches meet often with teachers to provide feedback on the progress being made by their respective students.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	4	9	13	4	10	7	4	4	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide assessment	2	0	5	8	9	13	19	11	5	0	0	0	0	72

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	1	7	3	10	13	22	18	8	0	0	0	0	82

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	2	5	3	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	20
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected

Friday 9/7/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	2	5	7	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	2	1	6	8	8	13	20	11	5	0	0	0	0	74
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	2	2	7	4	7	9	24	16	7	0	0	0	0	78

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	2	5	7	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	2	1	6	8	8	13	20	11	5	0	0	0	0	74
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	2	2	7	4	7	9	24	16	7	0	0	0	0	78

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The data component where students performed lowest was Math Lowest 25th Percentile. This is a trend as the data shows the following: 2016 at 62%; 2017 at 48%; 2018 at 47%.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Social Studies Achievement with a decline of 6 percentage points. Our school was so high-performing in this area the year prior, that the decline is minimal and the school still considers this tested area to be a strength, and not an area of focus.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The data component with the biggest gap when compared to the state average was Math Lowest 25th Percentile by 5 percentage points.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The data component that showed the most improvement was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. This isn't a trend based on the data, as 2016 and 2017 both showed this School Grade Component at 65%. It isn't until 2018 that you see the significant jump in achievement to 72%.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

The actions taken that led to the improvement in this area include providing teachers with training on the components of text-based writing and having teachers of all subject areas implement these strategies. Teachers learned how to effectively teach their students to support their thesis with evidence, use the FSA rubric as a guide, and how to revise and edit their essays to improve the quality of their writing. Additionally, the diagnostic program i-Ready was used to diagnose students' reading deficiencies, provide them with additional instruction based on the individual needs of the learners, and monitor students' progress. The data provided with the program was invaluable to teachers. Lastly, students were exposed to informational text in all subject areas. Social Studies Weekly and Scholastic Magazine were just two of the publications used weekly in the classroom in order to provide students with a greater opportunity to interact with non-fiction text.

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	67%	62%	60%	77%	56%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	61%	57%	65%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	72%	57%	52%	48%	53%	49%
Math Achievement	72%	65%	61%	67%	59%	56%
Math Learning Gains	63%	61%	58%	50%	57%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	55%	52%	62%	49%	48%
Science Achievement	56%	57%	57%	68%	53%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	87%	79%	77%	85%	71%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 (2)	4 (2)	9 (5)	13 (7)	4 (2)	10 (2)	7 (3)	4 (1)	4 (0)	57 (24)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	2 (2)	0 (1)	5 (6)	8 (8)	9 (8)	13 (13)	19 (20)	11 (11)	5 (5)	72 (74)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	74%	61%	13%	57%	17%
	2017	68%	58%	10%	58%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	70%	60%	10%	56%	14%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2017	63%	57%	6%	56%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2018	68%	59%	9%	55%	13%
	2017	62%	54%	8%	53%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
06	2018	49%	53%	-4%	52%	-3%
	2017	63%	53%	10%	52%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
07	2018	70%	54%	16%	51%	19%
	2017	70%	52%	18%	52%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2018	71%	59%	12%	58%	13%
	2017	67%	55%	12%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	84%	67%	17%	62%	22%
	2017	81%	65%	16%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	64%	68%	-4%	62%	2%
	2017	84%	68%	16%	64%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
05	2018	74%	66%	8%	61%	13%
	2017	65%	60%	5%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
06	2018	67%	56%	11%	52%	15%
	2017	65%	52%	13%	51%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
07	2018	70%	52%	18%	54%	16%
	2017	64%	49%	15%	53%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2018					
	2017	38%	39%	-1%	46%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	60%	56%	4%	55%	5%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2018	49%	44%	5%	50%	-1%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		49%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	87%	72%	15%	71%	16%
2017	82%	69%	13%	69%	13%
Compare		5%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	60%	59%	1%	62%	-2%
2017	55%	58%	-3%	60%	-5%
Compare		5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	33	69	80	48	63	40					
ELL	52	65	74	62	52	45	47				
BLK	36	69		36	56						
HSP	69	66	69	74	63	45	58	87	59		
WHT	69			75							
FRL	60	69	73	64	58	46	45	81	65		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	45			45							
ELL	54	58	52	57	67	53	23				
HSP	69	67	46	73	63	50	53	93			
WHT	75			75							
FRL	54	64	44	57	55	43	30				

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1

Title	Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile
Rationale	We have identified math learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile as a critical need area of focus. This population of students showed the least amount of gains with 47% in 2018. This low performance has been a trend the last two years, and we also saw a decrease of 1 percentage point from the 48% in 2017. This is impacting student learning and success because, based on the data, learning gaps are not being addressed adequately and students are projected to continue to struggle in math if the holes in their foundation of mathematical concepts are not addressed.
Intended Outcome	Our goal for the 2018-2019 school year is to have the lowest 25th percentile of students in math show an increase in learning gains from 47% to 50%, an increase of 3 percentage points.
Point Person	Sheila Caleo (920148@dadeschools.net)

Action Step

Description	To address this specific area of focus, the following Action Steps will be taken: -Math teachers will be provided a shared planning time in order to discuss, plan, and share best practices. -The diagnostic program iReady will be used with fidelity, with students completing a minimum of 45 minutes of math instruction on the program weekly. -After-school and Saturday tutoring will be offered and are mandatory. -Students will receive intervention on a daily basis through Pearson SuccessMaker. -The Lead Teacher and Curriculum Specialist will work closely with teachers to provide guidance, model lessons, lesson plan, and discuss concerns regarding student progress.
Person Responsible	Jacklyn Meyer (jmeyer@matergroveacademy.com)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description	The administrative team will create the master schedule around the teachers' planning time blocks in order to ensure teachers of the same subject are allotted sufficient time to plan together weekly. The assistant principal will print iReady usage reports every Monday morning to ensure the program is being used with fidelity. Teachers will submit attendance rosters to the assistant principal for all tutoring sessions offered. Additionally, the assistant principal will monitor student progress on SuccessMaker through their website. Lastly, she will ensure that at least once a week, the Lead Teacher and Curriculum Specialist do not have assigned tasks on their schedules other than meeting with teachers in order to dedicate time to support those faculty members.
Person Responsible	Elizabeth Toledo (toledo@dadeschools.net)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

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

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

The school implements a wide variety of communication methods in order to inform parents about upcoming events. Some of these methods include: monthly school calendar (posted on school website and emailed by homeroom teacher), PALS (Parents as Liaisons) newsletters, Constant Contact emails, Shutterfly class webpages, classroom websites, Parent Academy workshops and Remind 101. Principal and Assistant Principal will monitor implementation and review sign in sheets to determine the number of parents attending school or community events for effectiveness. Progress will be determined by analyzing sign in sheets for parent participation.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Our school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met by following each student's IEP. Our school counselor provides the services required as stipulated on each student's IEP. The counselor along with the teachers and SPED coordinator, collaborate to create a student's individual education plan by utilizing a student's anecdotal information and data. Teachers provide interventions and monitor student growth through the use of a progress monitoring plan to determine if the RTI process must be implemented.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

The school hosts several school tours and information meetings to prospective parents who are interested in the school. Parents and students are provided with information regarding open houses offered by neighboring public and charter schools.

For graduating students we have a Parent Night where we share important deadlines and information about high school options which include: magnet school applications, neighborhood schools and charter articulation agreements.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The school leadership team uses data in order to analyze student achievement. Each school year instructional positions are evaluated in terms of student achievement. Teachers are provided with professional development opportunities that will enhance their instructional practices with the end goal of increasing student achievement. The use of federal, state, and local funds are used to purchase instructional programs such as I-Ready, Study Island, Istation, and other core curriculum materials. ESSAC funds will be used to cover the cost of FSA tutoring resources.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Dade - 5045 - Mater Grove Academy - 2018-19 SIP
Mater Grove Academy

Total:	\$58,834.55
---------------	--------------------