# Mater Academy Charter High School



# 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Mater Academy Charter High School

## 7901 NW 103RD ST, Hialeah Gardens, FL 33016

### www.matermiddlehigh.org

## Demographics

## Principal: Alex Tamargo

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | High School<br>9-12 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 82% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (61%)<br><br>2017-18: A (64%)<br><br>2016-17: B (59%)<br><br>2015-16: B (54%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | N/A |
| * 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.](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 Academy Charter High School

## 7901 NW 103RD ST, Hialeah Gardens, FL 33016

### www.matermiddlehigh.org

## 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) |
|---|---|---|
| High School 9-12 | Yes | 83% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | Yes | 99% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | B | B | A | 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 Academy is to develop the intellectual and social skills of its students by facilitating a rigorous college preparatory curriculum and a wide range of educational resources within a safe learning environment. Students are expected to perform at or above grade level availing success in high school and within a global society. Our Mission is the Meaningful achievement of Academics facilitated by Teachers, administrators, parents and the community Enabling students to become confident, self-directed and Responsible lifelong learners.

### Provide the school's vision statement.

In collaboration with its teachers, parents, community, and administration it is the vision of Mater Academy to provide a meaningful and nurturing educational environment that promotes academic achievement for its students.

## 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Nunez, Jose | Principal | Responsible for Safety<br>Instructional Leader<br>Day-to-Day Operations<br>Personnel<br>Facilities Management |
| Castillo, Trishia | Assistant Principal | Responsible for Safety<br>Instructional Leader<br>Day-to-Day Operations<br>Personnel<br>Facilities Management |
| Alonso, Yolanda | Instructional Coach | Instructional Leader<br>Personnel Training and Coaching<br>Curriculum Development |
| Macho, Silvina | Instructional Technology | Media and Technology Specialist<br>Data Analysis |
| Castro, Diana | Teacher, ESE | IEP Monitoring<br>Special Education Monitoring |
| Marrero, Blanca | Teacher, ESE | ELL Coordinator<br>ELL Student Support<br>ELL Student Testing and Reporting |
| Alvarez, Maria | Teacher, Career/Technical | Classroom Teacher<br>Lead Teacher<br>Mentor Teacher |
| Llanes, Idelsy | Teacher, K-12 | Classroom Teacher<br>Department Chairperson<br>Mentor Teacher |
| Lopez, Elsa | Other | Testing Chairperson |
| Portela, Carmen | Teacher, K-12 | Classroom Teacher<br>Department Chairperson<br>Mentor Teacher |
| Sanchez, Luis | Other | Athletics Director |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Rodriguez, Jose | SAC Member | SAC Chair<br>Classroom Teacher<br>Mentor Teacher |
| Marty, Judith | Other | Chief Academic Officer for Mater Academy Inc Schools |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Saturday 7/1/2017, Alex Tamargo

**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.*

**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.*

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

53

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | High School<br>9-12 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 82% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (61%)<br>2017-18: A (64%)<br>2016-17: B (59%) |

| | 2015-16: B (54%) |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | [LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#) |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | N/A |
| * 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 434 | 408 | 422 | 404 | 1668 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 17 | 17 | 27 | 76 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 17 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 26 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 9 | 26 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 18 |

**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**

Thursday 8/27/2020

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 412 | 427 | 407 | 360 | 1606 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 12 | 5 | 35 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 8 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 56 | 41 | 23 | 125 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 111 |

**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 | 76 | 56 | 41 | 23 | 196 |

**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 | |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 412 | 427 | 407 | 360 | 1606 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 12 | 5 | 35 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 8 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 56 | 41 | 23 | 125 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 111 |

**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 | 76 | 56 | 41 | 23 | 196 |

**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 | |

## 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 | 68% | 59% | 56% | 68% | 56% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 56% | 54% | 51% | 60% | 51% | 49% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 40% | 48% | 42% | 52% | 45% | 41% |
| Math Achievement | 54% | 54% | 51% | 56% | 47% | 49% |
| Math Learning Gains | 42% | 52% | 48% | 45% | 47% | 44% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 34% | 51% | 45% | 26% | 45% | 39% |
| Science Achievement | 53% | 68% | 68% | 49% | 63% | 65% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 77% | 76% | 73% | 79% | 71% | 70% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | Total |
| | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| | (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 |
| 09 | 2019 | 67% | 55% | 12% | 55% | 12% |
| | 2018 | 69% | 54% | 15% | 53% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 66% | 53% | 13% | 53% | 13% |
| | 2018 | 67% | 54% | 13% | 53% | 14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 52% | 68% | -16% | 67% | -15% |
| 2018 | 54% | 65% | -11% | 65% | -11% |
| Compare | | -2% | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 77% | 71% | 6% | 70% | 7% |
| 2018 | 81% | 67% | 14% | 68% | 13% |
| Compare | | -4% | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 57% | 63% | -6% | 61% | -4% |
| 2018 | 55% | 59% | -4% | 62% | -7% |
| Compare | | 2% | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 52% | 54% | -2% | 57% | -5% |
| 2018 | 59% | 54% | 5% | 56% | 3% |
| Compare | | -7% | | | |

## 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 | 28 | 21 | 14 | 33 | 36 | | | | | 95 | 58 |
| ELL | 43 | 47 | 39 | 44 | 40 | 38 | 43 | 61 | | 100 | 97 |
| BLK | 51 | 58 | 47 | 38 | 50 | | | 56 | | 100 | 40 |
| HSP | 69 | 56 | 39 | 55 | 42 | 33 | 54 | 78 | | 99 | 85 |
| WHT | 69 | 62 | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 66 | 55 | 40 | 52 | 41 | 34 | 52 | 77 | | 99 | 83 |
| **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 | 33 | | 29 | 45 | | | 36 | | 100 | 43 |
| ELL | 55 | 61 | 50 | 63 | 58 | 63 | 61 | 56 | | 93 | 89 |
| BLK | 45 | 51 | 44 | 34 | 25 | | 27 | 75 | | 84 | 13 |
| HSP | 71 | 64 | 57 | 59 | 44 | 45 | 58 | 83 | | 98 | 73 |
| WHT | 83 | 70 | | 90 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 70 | 64 | 57 | 57 | 45 | 42 | 57 | 82 | | 97 | 71 |
| **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 | 26 | 35 | 27 | 24 | 30 | 10 | 18 | 35 | | 100 | 33 |
| ELL | 33 | 52 | 47 | 56 | 55 | 36 | 50 | 51 | | 90 | 78 |
| BLK | 43 | 47 | 62 | 32 | 38 | 18 | 43 | 53 | | | |
| HSP | 69 | 61 | 51 | 57 | 45 | 27 | 49 | 80 | | 97 | 60 |
| FRL | 68 | 61 | 53 | 55 | 44 | 24 | 50 | 78 | | 96 | 60 |

## 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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 61 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 70 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 676 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 41 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 57 |
| 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 | 55 |
| 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 | 62 |
| 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 | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 61 |
| 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.**

The data component that showed the lowest performance was our ELA and Mathematics Achievement in the lowest 25th Percentile. In 2018, the lowest 25th percentile in ELA had a pass rate of 51% while in 2019 the pass rate went down 16% to only a 40% pass rate. In mathematics the lowest 25th percentile in 2018 passed at 51% while in 2019, the pass rate was only 34% which was a decrease of 17%. The Contributing factors could be a lack of focus and identification of the students, a lack of proper interventions or inadequate interventions, and the need for increased differentiated instruction and effective instructional strategies.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was our ELA and Mathematics Achievement in the lowest 25th Percentile. In 2018, the lowest 25th percentile in ELA had a pass rate of 51% while in 2019 the pass rate went down 16% to only a 40% pass rate. In mathematics the lowest 25th percentile in 2018 passed at 51% while in 2019, the pass rate was only 34% which was a decrease of 17%. the Contributing factors could be a lack of focus and identification of the students, a lack of proper interventions or inadequate interventions, and the need for increased differentiated instruction and effective instructional strategies.

**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 showed the greatest gap was our ELA and Mathematics Achievement in the lowest 25th Percentile. In 2018, the lowest 25th percentile in ELA had a pass rate of 51% while in 2019 the pass rate went down 16% to only a 40% pass rate. In mathematics the lowest 25th percentile in 2018 passed at 51% while in 2019, the pass rate was only 34% which was a decrease of 17%. the Contributing factors could be a lack of focus and identification of the students, a lack of proper interventions or inadequate interventions, and the need for increased differentiated instruction and effective instructional strategies.

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

Advanced Placement Scores in certain subjects showed a marked improvement. Most notably, AP Comparative Government increased from a 16% pass rate in 2018 to a 50% pass rate in 2019. Additionally, AP Computer Science Principles increase from a 30% pass rate to a 57% pass rate.

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

Based on the EWS data, a potential area of concern are the number of students who score a level 1 on a state assessment. These students will be part of our lower quartile group and will need additional service and support.

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

1. A focus on Social-Emotional Learning Training and Instruction
2. Identify, Track, and Provide Interventions for our Lower Quartile
3. Advanced Academics Department Formation and provide increased opportunities for students
4. In Response to COVID-19 increased access to technology, training and health and wellness protocols
5. Improved Technology Instruction / Facilities

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Lowest 25th Percentile Students in ELA and Mathematics<br>The students in the lower 25th percentile in both ELA and Mathematics showed decreases in achievement from the 2018 to the 2019 school year. In 2018, 56% of Students in the Lowest 25th Percentile in ELA achieved mastery while in 2019 only 40% of students achieved mastery. In 2018, 45% of students in the Lowest 25th Percentile in Mathematics achieved mastery while in 2019 only 34% of students achieved mastery. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | For the 2020-2021 school year the goal is to have at least 56% of students in the Lowest 25th Percentile in ELA achieve mastery and at least 45% of students in the lowest 25th percentile in mathematics achieve mastery. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jose Nunez (tigernunez@dadeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Evidence-based strategy that will be implemented is the targeted use of paraprofessionals and tutoring services. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Based on the results from 2018-2019, those students who participated in a structured pull-out or push-in tutoring program with paraprofessionals saw increased learning gains. In fact, on average, 80% of students who received this remediation strategy saw learning gains and improved results. No State Assessments were administered in the 2019-2020 School Year. |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify the lowest 25th percentile in both English Language Arts and Mathematics
2. Share list of students with both teachers and paraprofessionals include student data and results
3. Create a structured schedule of pull-out and push-in tutoring sessions for the lowest 25th percentile students
4. Work with classroom teachers to develop quality lessons based on standards of greatest weakness
5. Monitor through through walk-through observations, progress monitoring assessment and Edgenuity Diagnostic Assessments

| **Person Responsible** | Yolanda Alonso (yalonso@dadeschools.net) |
|---|---|

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**In addition to our School Wide Area of Focus, Three other school-wide improvement priorities include:**

**1) a focus on social- emotional education and mental health wellness. This will be addressed by**
**- Mental health training for all faculty and staff**
**- Socio-emotional learning lessons conducted through social students classes for students**
**- Positive reinforcement and messages throughout the school**
**- Continued school wide Student-Services initiatives including Red Ribbon Week, Health Fairs, Guest Speakers and Wellness Campaigns**

**2) a focus on advanced academics. This will be addressed by:**
**- increased opportunities for accelerated courses including High School College Level Classes**
**- Saturday tutoring for enrichment and advancement**
**- a revised after care enrichment program**
**- accelerated study abroad program**

**3) a focus on Technology and Health in response COVID-10**
**-increased access to technology for teachers and students**
**-increased cleanliness and health and safety measures**
**-increased training in responding to health and safety concerns**
**-pivot to remote live instruction and various technology platforms as needed.**

## 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.

Positive Culture and Environment
The school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders through a variety of outreach and informational session. First, EESAC - the Educational Excellence School Advisory Council meets on the 2nd Tuesday of the month, 6 times in the school year. This is an opportunity for parents, students, teachers, stake-holders, and administrators to gather and discuss the school improvement plan goals and progress. Additionally, monthly Parent Academies and the Title I Information Meetings are held to provide parental support on a variety of topics based on parent feedback from the previous year. Our ConnectED system, School Website, and Social Media Platforms provide timely information and announcements to all stakeholders and also celebrate and share the successes and activities of the school community. Four times a year, parents are invited to discuss student grades, effort

and conduct with teachers and administrators through our quarterly parent conferences. During this time of COVID-19 and Remote live instruction the school will additionally implement Zoom Town Hall Meetings for both parents and students, increased Zoom Office Hours, a Mater Helps email address (materhelps@materacademy.com) and regular social media and website posting.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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