School District of Osceola County, FL

Mater Brighton Lakes

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mater Brighton Lakes

3200 PLEASANT HILL RD, Kissimmee, FL 34746

https://www.materbrightonlakes.com

Demographics

Principal: Carmen Cangemi

Start Date for this Principal: 7/17/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (60%) 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

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, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at 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.

Table of Contents

Mater Brighton Lakes

3200 PLEASANT HILL RD, Kissimmee, FL 34746

https://www.materbrightonlakes.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	87%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	92%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	B	B

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.

The mission of Mater Brighton Lakes Academy is as follows:
Lead to inspire
Establish Relationships
Aspire for Excellence
Discover your Voice

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Mater Brighton Lakes Academy is create a community of leaders and life-long learners.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cangemi, Carmen	Principal	PreK-8 school principal
Llerena, Lizaira	Administrative Support	Lead Teacher for PreK-8.
Irizarry, Charlyn	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Chair for 1st grade.
Wiscovitch, Annette	Teacher, K-12	Grade level chair for 4th grade.
Nuscis, Holly	Teacher, K-12	Geometry Teacher and Activities Director
Zilinskas, Susan	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach for PreK-2.
Rivera, Evelin	Other	ESOL Coordinator
Navarro, Belissa	Teacher, ESE	ESE Teacher
Moran, Tyler	Administrative Support	Lead Teacher for grade 9
Ruiz, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Chair for Mathematics and Science.
Marroquin, Morgan	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Chair for 3rd grade.
Maher, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Chair for ELA and Social Studies.
Rodriguez, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach for grades 3-5 and MTSS Coordinator.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	112	94	92	111	82	93	129	103	136	0	0	0	0	952
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	10	18	13	15	39	0	0	0	0	110

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	1	1	3	19	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	7

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
60

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 9/30/2019

Prior Year - 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	20	13	6	7	9	13	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	23	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	17	31	25	38	33	0	0	0	0	155

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	24	20	0	0	0	0	53

Prior Year - 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	20	13	6	7	9	13	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	23	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	17	31	25	38	33	0	0	0	0	155

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	24	20	0	0	0	0	53

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	53%	56%	61%	57%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	57%	59%	61%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	55%	54%	57%	54%	51%
Math Achievement	52%	52%	62%	60%	50%	58%
Math Learning Gains	55%	55%	59%	68%	55%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	49%	52%	62%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	50%	49%	56%	39%	47%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	75%	78%	0%	71%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	112 (0)	94 (0)	92 (0)	111 (0)	82 (0)	93 (0)	129 (0)	103 (0)	136 (0)	952 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (20)	0 (13)	0 (6)	0 (7)	0 (9)	0 (13)	0 (1)	0 (6)	0 (1)	0 (76)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (1)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (30)	0 (23)	0 (54)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	15 (11)	10 (17)	18 (31)	13 (25)	15 (38)	39 (33)	110 (155)

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019	43%	51%	-8%	58%	-15%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	57%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	51%	1%	58%	-6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	46%	48%	-2%	56%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	54%	48%	6%	56%	-2%
	2018	61%	50%	11%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
06	2019	63%	48%	15%	54%	9%
	2018	52%	46%	6%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
07	2019	46%	47%	-1%	52%	-6%
	2018	50%	46%	4%	51%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
08	2019	50%	49%	1%	56%	-6%
	2018	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	40%	54%	-14%	62%	-22%
	2018	57%	51%	6%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	53%	14%	64%	3%
	2018	57%	53%	4%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	43%	48%	-5%	60%	-17%
	2018	47%	52%	-5%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
06	2019	61%	45%	16%	55%	6%
	2018	47%	43%	4%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
07	2019	50%	30%	20%	54%	-4%
	2018	46%	29%	17%	54%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	30%	47%	-17%	46%	-16%
	2018	21%	43%	-22%	45%	-24%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	57%	45%	12%	53%	4%
	2018	65%	49%	16%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	38%	42%	-4%	48%	-10%
	2018	34%	42%	-8%	50%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	73%	73%	0%	71%	2%
2018	54%	70%	-16%	71%	-17%
Compare	19%				
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	65%	49%	16%	61%	4%
2018	67%	52%	15%	62%	5%
Compare	-2%				

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	14	32	29	19	51	38	17				
ELL	40	54	56	46	59	48	38	58			
BLK	58	66	76	50	45	40	49	84	67		
HSP	49	57	54	50	56	46	47	68	55		
MUL	58	36		58	55						
WHT	65	62		67	67		67	80			
FRL	50	59	54	47	51	45	45	75	59		
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	13	37	38	13	40	42	8				
ELL	30	59	61	39	50	45	34	15			
BLK	59	55	45	50	48	23	49	56	50		
HSP	51	56	55	50	47	43	50	52	58		
MUL	69			62							
WHT	63	53		55	53	46	50	55			
FRL	54	56	52	50	49	40	51	52	58		
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	9	32	46	16	37	38					
ELL	39	56	46	51	65	57	32				
BLK	58	76	77	54	70	67	35				
HSP	54	55	51	60	67	62	33				
WHT	71	81		65	66						
FRL	54	63	61	55	69	63	33				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	571
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	52
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	68
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that performed the lowest was Mathematics in the Lowest 25th Percentile. In 2018, this was also our lowest performance area, but we have made improvement from 2018-2019. Overall, math is our area of weakness with inexperienced teachers; teachers that are new to the subject or are career changers and not been through a teacher preparation program. We will be working closely with the math department to provide extra resources and PDs to allow for them to gain more experience and become experts in their field.

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

We experienced a one point decline in ELA Achievement from 54% to 53%. There were many changes in the ELA department with new personnel teaching at our school for the first time, and an increase in class sizes in certain grades due to lower enrollment numbers which forced department and class changes. These factors resulted in a slight decline in achievement.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Math Achievement. Our school scored 52% and the State scored at 62%, so we fell 10% below the State. Math is overall our area of weakness, and we know we need to be creating stronger math teachers that are able to intensify instruction and close learning gaps to create strong mathematicians. We did make a slight gain from the year prior, so it is a start in the right direction.

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

Our Social Studies Achievement showed the most improvement, with a 20% gain from 54% to 74%. This was our teachers' second year teaching and assessing students in this subject area. They have become more familiar with the content and have requested extra teaching resources to use to further assist and improve their students' knowledge level. In combination, this has been successful and allowed us the opportunity to show great growth.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part 1, an area of concern we currently have is our number of Level 1 students on the FSA. These are students we must focus more time and attention on for interventions to ensure they receive the supports that are necessary to allow them the opportunity to make learning gains and reach proficiency. We have been revamping our ESE department and including new experienced personnel to provide our teachers with extra support and resources to be able to meet the needs of those Level 1 students.

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

1. ELA Achievement
2. Math Achievement
3. Science Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Differentiated Instruction in Literacy
Rationale	Differentiated instruction is not being properly implemented in all classrooms across the entire school.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Through more targeted instruction and emphasis on differentiated instruction in literacy, there will be an increase in student achievement in ELA. We intend to ensure high levels of learning to increase proficiency in all categories of reading: oral reading fluency, comprehension, vocabulary, writing, and grammar. We will assess students at their grade level, determine their deficiencies and intervene at their weakest point to increase proficiency to an overall proficiency rate of 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	All teachers will closely monitor progress in ELA using iReady diagnostic data. We will assess students using iReady three times in a year. In between diagnostic sessions, we will hold data chats with teachers to analyze student scores and determine which students are in need of interventions to allow for differentiated instruction. The differentiated and small group instruction will be based upon the information gained from the iReady diagnostic assessment, which indicates which specific domain area in reading to target.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Literacy is an area where we haven't shown consistent growth and have been at least 6-8% below the State, so we would like to put more focus and emphasis on it in order to build a strong problem that is going to create proficient readers. By using diagnostic data we will be providee with a clear prescription for those students that currently need differentiated, small group instruction in areas of deficiency to close the learning gap and create proficient readers.

Action Step	
Description	Teacher teams will meet each month during early release and on two individual planning periods a month, for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising plans on course progression of individual student's needs as a Collaborative Team. Teacher teams will track every student by standard using a tracker, on the spot formative assessments, common formative assessments, and summative assessments to track the progression of standards mastery. Students will be provided Tier 2 instruction based on grade level standards and content using data, student by standard tracking, collaborative planning, and data analysis. Students will provide Tier 3 instruction based on gaps in literacy foundations: phonics, phonemic awareness and fluency. Professional development will be conducted throughout the year to build shared knowledge of highly effective ELA instruction. Tier 1 Core Instruction will be strengthened by the provision of ongoing professional development provided by the District for all grades K-8. The Grade Level Chairs will provide professional development sessions to teachers as they request it and the need arises. The Leadership Team will determine areas of need through observation and data. Development sessions are data driven based off of data collected through Leadership Walks, Stocktake Meetings, and Coaching for Implementation. All students will be monitored using iReady at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. SWD will receive grade level instruction. The work will be scaffolded to meet their needs and will be supported by the VE teacher when applicable. SWD will receive intervention based on their Tier 3, Tier 2, and Tier 1 individual needs. Teacher delivers daily content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by

ensuring standardized lessons and using differentiated instruction for ELL and ESE students. And monitored by the ESOL Compliance Specialist and RCS.

Person Responsible Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)

#2	
Title	Differentiated Instruction in Mathematics
Rationale	Differentiated instruction is not properly implemented in all classrooms across the entire school.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Through more targeted instruction and emphasis on differentiated instruction in mathematics, there will be an increase in student achievement in Mathematics. We intend to ensure high levels of learning to increase proficiency in all categories of mathematics: number and operations, algebra and algebraic thinking, measurement and data, and geometry . We will assess students at their grade level, determine their deficiencies and intervene at their weakest point to increase proficiency to an overall proficiency rate of 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	All teachers will closely monitor progress in mathematics using iReady diagnostic data. We will assess students using iReady three times a year. In between diagnostic sessions, we will hold data chats with teachers to analyze student scores and determine which students are in need of interventions to allow for differentiated instruction. The differentiated, small group instruction will be based upon the information gained from the iReady diagnostic assessment, which indicates the specific domain area in math to target.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Math has consistently been our area of weekness, by being 10% below the State average, so in order to create a strong math department and proficient mathematicians, extra resources and supports are necessary. By using the iReady diagnostic data we will be provided a clear prescription for those students that currently need differentiated, small group instruction in areas of deficiency to close learning gaps and create proficient mathematicians.

Action Step	
Description	Once an assessment has been taken, teachers will determine individual student needs based on errors made. Students will then receive interventions based on those errors to clarify any misconceptions about a particular strategy used. Teachers will track student data by Standards. After a standard has been assessed, teachers will place student scores in the tracker. Teachers will provide interventions as needed and reassess students to monitor their learning. Monitor and Support - During PLC's teachers will continue to view student data and determine appropriate next steps based on individual student needs. Students will track their own learning through teacher provided success criteria. Teachers will provide individual student data chats, while working with students to set goals for themselves, which will be monitored with subsequent data chats. The Grade Level Chair will provide professional development sessions to teachers as they request it and the need arises. The Leadership Team will determine areas of need through observation and data. Development sessions are data driven based off of data collected through Leadership Walks, Stocktake Meetings, and Coaching for Implementation. Teachers will provide Tier 2 instruction based on grade level standards and content using data, student by standard tracking, collaborative planning, and data analysis. Teachers will provide Tier 3 instruction based on gaps in mathematics contents.
Person Responsible	Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)

#3	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	We have not been able to experience science achievement gains in the last couple of years and would like to see our science program gain momentum for growth, and knowledge for our students.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Through more targeted instruction and emphasis on extra resources and instructional materials, there will be an increase in student achievement in Science. We intend to ensure high levels of learning to increase proficiency in Science. We will assess students on grade level standards to determine their deficiencies and intervene to increase proficiency to an overall proficiency rate of 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using USA Test Prep standards-based assessment data, we will be provided with a clear prescription to identify which standards teachers need to highly target to ensure students are on target for proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We have consistently been 6-7% below the State averages, and we have not been able to show growth and have remained stagnant. By putting extra emphasis on this department and utilizing further supports and instructional supplies, we're looking to see growth in this area. Such implementation will include: USA Test Prep, advanced placement courses, Biology, hiring experienced teachers, and Prepworks.

Action Step	
Description	Individual data chats will be conducted with the leadership team three times during the school year to ensure teachers have guidance pertaining to instructional choices made for individual students. Data chats are also an opportunity for the leadership to be involved in the monitoring of specific students and recognize grade level or content specific trends across the school.
Tier 2 Interventions - Once an assessment has been taken, teachers will determine individual student needs based on deficient content. Students will then receive additional resources and support to sharpen their comprehension.
Data Tracking Student by Standard - Teachers will tracker essential standards. After a standard has been assessed, teachers will place student scores in the tracker. Teachers will provide interventions as needed and reassess students to monitor their learning.
Teachers will track student data by Standard - After a standard has been assessed, teachers will place student scores in the tracker. Teachers will provide interventions as needed and reassess students to monitor their learning.
During PLC's teachers will continue to view student data and determine appropriate next steps based on individual student needs.
Students will track their own learning through teacher provided success criteria.
Teachers will provide individual student data chats, while working with students to set goals for themselves, which will be monitored with subsequent data chats.
The Grade Level Chair will provide professional development sessions to teachers as they request it and the need arises. The Leadership Team will determine areas of need through observation and data. Development sessions are data driven based off of data collected through Leadership Walks, Stocktake Meetings, and Coaching for Implementation.

Person Responsible	Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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 will foster positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission by allowing parents to volunteer and become part of our PALS (Parents as Liasons) program.

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.

The school counselor has an open-door policy where students feel comfortable coming and sharing their social and emotional concerns. She has established a group meeting schedule to monitor and address the needs of students with behavior/ social and emotional needs.

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

Incoming Cohorts- Mater Brighton Lakes employs a lottery system in which all applicants shall have an equal chance of being admitted through a random selection process conducted in conformity with Florida's Charter School Legislation. The school shall enroll any eligible student who submits a timely application. Siblings, employee and board member's children are given priority for registration at Mater Brighton Lakes.
Outgoing Cohorts- MBL has students up to 8th grade. The school is currently expanding to add one grade level each year until it reaches 12th grade.

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 leadership team (Carmen Cangemi, Lizaira Llerena, Tyler Moran, Susan Zilinskas, Michelle Rodriguez, Holly Nuscis, Samantha Hood) meets on a weekly basis to discuss any areas in need of improvement in all curricular areas in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize student outcomes. Instructional personnel and support staff are assigned according to where the team feels they can best serve the students. Resources are evaluated at the end of each year based on the input from teachers, and data is used to make decisions and changes in order to utilize resources that will have the highest impact in student achievement. We utilize resources from the following federal programs: Title I, Part A To ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted; extended learning opportunities, such as before and/or after school programs, and/or Saturday and/or summer school, are offered.Title I, Part C- the Title I Migrant Center staff is available to ensure that all migrant students are given a fair and equitable opportunity to achieve a high quality education.Title I, Part D- we will coordinate efforts with the Alternative Programs Department to ensure that all student needs are met.Title III-the identification of Limited English Proficiency, immigrant, and Native American students most at-risk in meeting state standards. Support research-based, comprehensive educational programs are used to help reduce the educational barriers that result from cultural and linguistic needs. IDEA provides support for students with an Individual Education Plan, students identified through the Preschool Education Evaluation Program, and students identified through the gifted screening process for all second grade Title I students.Title IX To help eliminate barriers for education the District Homeless Education Liaison works with the school FIT Liaisons to help define and protect the rights of homeless students to enroll in, attend, and succeed in our public schools.

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

MBL has at it's core a "Not if, but where" philosophy regarding college and career readyness. The school employs the following methods in order to promote this iniative:
- Career Day- MBL coordinates a Career Day to expose students to multiple careers and opportunities.
- College Going Culture - At MBL, every Homeroom develops a College and Career bulletin board which depics their graduating class (e.i. Class of 2020) and different career paths in their future.
- Library books: MBL's Library has career oriented books the students can explore to research.
- Take your Child to Work - MBL encourages parents to "Take their Child to Work" so the students can be exposed to their parents' careers.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Differentiated Instruction in Literacy				$35,402.80
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100		0163 - Mater Brighton Lakes	Title, I Part A		$26,402.80
			Notes: Student Workbooks (Consumables Supplemental)-iReady LAFS workbooks			
	5100		0163 - Mater Brighton Lakes	Title, I Part A		$2,000.00
			Notes: Software Licenses-Coach Digital			
	5100		0163 - Mater Brighton Lakes	Title, I Part A		$7,000.00
			Notes: Software Licenses-iReady			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Differentiated Instruction in Mathematics				$10,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100		0163 - Mater Brighton Lakes	Title, I Part A		$1,500.00
			Notes: Software Licenses-PrepWorks			
	5100		0163 - Mater Brighton Lakes	Title, I Part A		$2,000.00
			Notes: Software Licenses-Coach Digital			
	5100		0163 - Mater Brighton Lakes	Title, I Part A		$7,000.00
			Notes: Software Licenses-iReady			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Science Achievement**				**$7,270.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100		0163 - Mater Brighton Lakes	Title, I Part A		$4,875.00
			Notes: Software Licenses-USA Test Prep			
	5100		0163 - Mater Brighton Lakes	Title, I Part A		$2,395.00
			Notes: Software Licenses-BrainPop			
					Total:	**$53,172.80**