

School District of Osceola County, FL

Mater Palms Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Mater Palms Academy

401 S POINCIANA BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34746

www.materpalms.com

Demographics

Principal: Jorge Rivas

Start Date for this Principal: 9/22/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 82% |
| 2019-20 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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Mater Palms Academy

401 S POINCIANA BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34746

www.materpalms.com

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School KG-8 | Yes | 80% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | Yes | 82% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A | A | C |

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.

Together, we will cultivate a positive, dynamic environment of RESPECT and learning.

Challenges will be accepted and OVERCOME with integrity, knowing we can ACCOMPLISH any goal.

We will RISE to be active, empathetic scholars and leaders who impact the world in a positive way.

Mater Academy will provide students of Osceola County with a viable educational choice that offers an innovative, rigorous, and seamless K-8 curriculum serving as a foundation for a successful college preparatory high school experience. The school is committed to a core philosophy focused on students' intellectual and social development and will thereby offer a disciplined, balanced, and enriched education of the highest quality as it has proven to do through the Mater Academy Network of high quality charter schools.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We resolve to enrich, engage, and support all students through their educational journey.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------|---------------------|---|
| Cueto, Monica | Principal | Ms Cueto provides strategic direction and academic engagement. She monitors the development and implementation of curricula, assesses teaching methods, monitors student achievement, encourages parent involvement, revises policies and procedures, administers the budget, hires and evaluates staff and oversees maintenance and the facilities. |
| Sanchez, Erika | Assistant Principal | Mrs. Sanchez works with teachers to develop curriculum standards and observes teachers and evaluates learning materials to determine areas where improvement is needed. She responds to disciplinary issues and enforces disciplinary/attendance rules. She meets with parents to discuss student behavioral or learning concerns. She supports the principal with hiring and training staff and the coordination of day to day school facilities and activities. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 9/22/2020, Jorge Rivas

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 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 |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 82% |
| 2019-20 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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: 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 . | |

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 | 100 | 109 | 106 | 93 | 95 | 89 | 83 | 85 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 841 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 28 | 20 | 11 | 12 | 14 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 19 | 17 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 20 | 20 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/22/2020

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 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 90 | 99 | 75 | 90 | 75 | 62 | 82 | 81 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 702 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| One or more suspensions | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 12 | 11 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 15 | 26 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | |

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 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

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 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 90 | 99 | 75 | 90 | 75 | 62 | 82 | 81 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 702 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| One or more suspensions | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 12 | 11 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 15 | 26 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | |

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 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

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 | 58% | 56% | 61% | 0% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 73% | 57% | 59% | 0% | 59% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 76% | 55% | 54% | 0% | 54% | 51% |
| Math Achievement | 63% | 52% | 62% | 0% | 50% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 79% | 55% | 59% | 0% | 55% | 56% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 69% | 49% | 52% | 0% | 52% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 44% | 49% | 56% | 0% | 47% | 53% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 83% | 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 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

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 | 2019 | 58% | 51% | 7% | 58% | 0% |
| | 2018 | 62% | 51% | 11% | 57% | 5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 68% | 51% | 17% | 58% | 10% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 48% | 5% | 56% | -3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 15% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 47% | 48% | -1% | 56% | -9% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 50% | 3% | 55% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 55% | 48% | 7% | 54% | 1% |
| | 2018 | 50% | 46% | 4% | 52% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 57% | 47% | 10% | 52% | 5% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 43% | 46% | -3% | 51% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 14% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 53% | 49% | 4% | 56% | -3% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 69% | 54% | 15% | 62% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 79% | 51% | 28% | 62% | 17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 74% | 53% | 21% | 64% | 10% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 53% | -14% | 62% | -23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 35% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 50% | 48% | 2% | 60% | -10% |
| | 2018 | 59% | 52% | 7% | 61% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 63% | 45% | 18% | 55% | 8% |
| | 2018 | 54% | 43% | 11% | 52% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 64% | 30% | 34% | 54% | 10% |
| | 2018 | 50% | 29% | 21% | 54% | -4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 14% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 19% | 47% | -28% | 46% | -27% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -31% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 40% | 45% | -5% | 53% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 38% | 49% | -11% | 55% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 44% | 42% | 2% | 48% | -4% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 62% | -62% | 67% | -67% |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 79% | 73% | 6% | 71% | 8% |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 62% | -62% | 70% | -70% |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 92% | 49% | 43% | 61% | 31% |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 44% | -44% | 57% | -57% |
| 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 | 6 | 54 | | 25 | 69 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 46 | 72 | 73 | 60 | 73 | 61 | 34 | 79 | | | |
| BLK | 53 | 67 | | 29 | 64 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 59 | 77 | 80 | 64 | 78 | 68 | 45 | 83 | 91 | | |
| MUL | 60 | | | 80 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 58 | | 65 | 91 | | 37 | 92 | | | |
| FRL | 56 | 71 | 78 | 59 | 72 | 63 | 35 | 75 | | | |
| 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 | 20 | | | 20 | | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| ELL | 30 | 38 | 36 | 36 | 42 | 30 | | | | | |
| HSP | 52 | 55 | 38 | 58 | 53 | 50 | 36 | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | | | 59 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 53 | 58 | 46 | 57 | 53 | 44 | 41 | | | | |
| 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 |

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 | 68 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| 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 | 684 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 39 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 62 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |

| 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% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 53 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 71 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 70 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 66 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 63 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

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.

So the 2019 data analysis indicated that the data component with the lowest performance is Science, with a 44 percent. Factors contributing to low performance in this category is a lack of cohesion in vertical alignment in NGSS Standards across upper elementary and middle school grade levels. Additionally, low efficacy of progress monitoring contributed to a deficit in overall achievement.

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

The biggest data component that displayed a deficit was 8th grade math learning proficiency. Students displayed a 35% gain in the areas of 8th grade learning gains, but the largest factor contributing to the decline of proficiency was an increased enrollment in this grade area that doubled the number of students that were in 8th grade from 2018-2019.

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.

Science proficiency in 8th grade and 5th grade displayed our biggest gap compared to the state average. Factors that contribute to the gap include a lack of progress monitoring across middle school grade levels to measure proficiency and efficacy in content areas.

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

The biggest area of improvement was Mathematics Learning Gains. We implemented new tutoring and progress monitoring initiatives to support students learning progression and increase gains across areas.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

The biggest area of concern that will be targeted and addressed is Students With Disabilities. There are opportunities to develop and implement procedures to increase learning gains across this sub population. Additionally, ELA Proficiency across 3-8 grade can be targeted and addressed with students to support continued growth.

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

1. increase the gap with our ESE population
2. show growth with our ELL population of students who are two years or greater.
3. Increase ELA Proficiency in all grade levels
4. Achieve Acceleration Gains in Geometry and Biology
5. Science Achievement in 5th and 8th grade

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus | Based on our data Science has been an area of focus and concern as we have not seen the gains we would like. Our goal is to increase our resources in Science education so that knowledge and growth is developmental. |
| Description and Rationale: | |
| Measurable Outcome: | Through more targeted instruction and emphasis on extra resources and instructional materials, there will be aq 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 65%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Erika Sanchez (esanchez@materpalms.com) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Using USA Test Prep standards-based assessment data, we will provide 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 are currently 12 % points below the State average - showing slow growth from 2018 to 2019. This indicates that we have not been able to show significant growth in this area. Our goal is to utilize USA Test Prep with fidelity so that our students can show significant gains and growth. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff will be trained in best practices and strategies for increasing student engagement and understanding through quality instruction to improve student scientific knowledge.
2. Components of content-relevant strategies will include whole group instruction, small group instruction and one to one data chats with students to meet their individual needs.
3. Training and mentoring will be offered in small group instruction to teachers.
4. After analyzing student diagnostic data on a quarterly basis, staff will identify students in need of targeted, tiered interventions, and be provided with instructional strategies to improve their knowledge.
5. Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on formative assessments.
6. Additional support will be offered to those students who continue to struggle.
7. We will use progress monitoring datam classroom observations, and scoring rubrics to identify students needs.

Person Responsible Erika Sanchez (esanchez@materpalms.com)

Data Tracking by 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.

Person Responsible Erika Sanchez (esanchez@materpalms.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Differentiated Instruction in ELA through an increase in targeted instruction and emphasis on literacy.

Measurable Outcome: Through more targeted instruction and emphasis on differentiated instruction in literacy, there will be an increase in student achievement in ELA. We will assess students at their grade level, determine their deficiencies and intervene at their weakest point to increase proficiency to an overall rate of 65%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Erika Sanchez (esanchez@materpalms.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: All teachers will closely monitor progress in ELA using I Ready diagnostic data. We will assess students using I Ready three times a year. We will also conduct data chats with teachers to analyze student scores and determine which students are in need of interventions and differentiated instruction. Small groups will be created based on the information gathered from the diagnostic assessment, focusing on specific domains in reading that we must target.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: ELA is an area that is vital across all content areas. Our trajectory has been that we have missed the state average by just a few percentage points - in 2018 by 6 % and in 2019 by 3%. By using diagnostic data and having discussions with teachers surrounding their data - we will be better equipped to form small groups and make a greater impact. According to evidence-based research, it has been noted that small group instruction is highly effective focusing on the specific needs of the students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff will be trained in best practices and strategies for increasing student engagement and understanding through quality instruction to improve literacy.
2. Components of content-relevant strategies will include whole and small group instruction, and one to one data chats with students in order to meet their individual needs.
3. Training utilizing small group instructional strategies will be offered to teachers.
4. Data will be analyzed on a quarterly basis, students will be selected based on assessment criteria and groups will be formulated. Tiered interventions will be executed and monitored.
5. Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and data related to student achievement on formative assessments.
6. Additional supports will be offered to students who continue to struggle.
7. Staff will use the progress monitoring data, classroom observations, and rubrics to identify students needs.

Person Responsible Erika Sanchez (esanchez@materpalms.com)

Tier 3 instruction will be given based on gaps in foundational skills. Professional development will be offered to staff members to develop highly effective ELA instruction. Professional Development in all grades K-8 in Tier 1 Core instruction will build and reinforce our ability to provide enriched and rigorous instruction.

Person Responsible Erika Sanchez (esanchez@materpalms.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

After a careful look at our school data, the leadership team discussed the importance of working closely with our SWD population. These students have been identified as needing support in both ELA and Mathematics.

The leadership team will meet with the MTSS Coordinator and teachers to review plan of action with struggling students. They will review individual needs and coordinate a plan to assist students.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Motivation, success, and feeling valued are what drives individuals. At Mater Palms Academy, it is critically important that we celebrate and recognize the outstanding things that our school community accomplishes, both inside and out of our buildings. Here are some of the main contributors to creating, building, and sustaining our positive school culture.

Relationships are perhaps the most important part of establishing a school culture. When people feel valued, staff, and students alike, they are likely to work harder, stay the course, and enjoy their work. "When students feel liked and respected by their teachers, they find more success in school, academically, and behaviorally" (Lewis, Schaps & Watson, 1996). It is the goal of all Administration, Teachers, and staff at Mater Palms Academy to foster and forward positive relationships with students and among peers, parents, and the community. At Mater Palms Academy we promote and celebrate kindness among all.

We will involve parents in an organized, ongoing, and timely way in the planning, review, and improvement of schoolwide programs and the school parental involvement policy by providing opportunities for parents and the local community to plan, implement and evaluate school improvement activities; including the construction and the revision of the Title I School-Wide plan. In addressing this component, the school creates strategies that are consistent with the parental involvement requirements of Title1, Part A. The school pays special attention to building parents' capacity for involvement and designs ways in which parents can be brought into the instructional program and contribute to the academic achievement of their children.

The relationship between the school and parents is critical for student success within Mater Palms Academy. Parents are valuable stakeholders that will bring a wealth of resources to classroom instruction as well as provide the reinforcement and support needed for students to excel in their academic quests. Parents are informed of events/activities using flyers, ClassTag, DOJO, social media, email, and updated website. Parental involvement will be fostered using four strategies, which include intentional

communication, parental support services, student showcase experiences, and school volunteer opportunities.

We will conduct an annual meeting, at a convenient time, to inform parents about the school's Title I program, the nature of the Title I program, the parents' requirements and the school parental involvement policy, the schoolwide plan, and the school-parent compact and encourage and invite all parents of participating children to attend by

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------|--|---------------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$176,482.99 |