Mater Performing Arts & Entertainment Academy

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mater Performing Arts & Entertainment Academy

7901 NW 103RD ST, Hialeah Gardens, FL 33016

www.matermiddlehigh.org

Demographics

Principal: Alex Tamargo

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2001

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	79%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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.

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 Performing Arts & Entertainment Academy

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	84%

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	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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 Instructional Leader Day-to-Day Operations Personnel Facilities Management
Ulloa, Kismet	Assistant Principal	Responsible for Safety Instructional Leader Day-to-Day Operations Personnel Facilities Management
Alonso, Yolanda	Instructional Coach	Instructional Leader Personnel Training and Coaching Curriculum Development
Macho, Silvina	Instructional Media	Media and Technology Specialist Data Analysis
Castro, Diana	Teacher, ESE	SPED Program Specialist IEP Monitoring Special Education Monitoring
Marrero, Blanca	Instructional Coach	ELL Coordinator ELL Student Support ELL Student Testing and Reporting
Fonteriz, Mildred	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair Classroom Teacher
Lopez, Elsa	Other	Department Chair Testing Chairperson
Marty, Judith		Chief Academic Officer, Mater Inc Schools
Rodriguez, Jose	SAC Member	SAC Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2001, 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
23

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	79%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	80	78	72	301
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	1	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	14	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	11

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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
Monday 8/24/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	87	78	74	323
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	7	11	6	35

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	4	1	2	1	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	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	84	87	78	74	323
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	7	11	6	35

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	4	1	2	1	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	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	81%	59%	56%	80%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	54%	51%	62%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	48%	42%	53%	45%	41%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	60%	54%	51%	63%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	31%	52%	48%	40%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	15%	51%	45%	24%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	57%	68%	68%	56%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	87%	76%	73%	90%	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	86%	55%	31%	55%	31%
	2018	73%	54%	19%	53%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	76%	53%	23%	53%	23%
	2018	86%	54%	32%	53%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
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	57%	68%	-11%	67%	-10%
2018	61%	65%	-4%	65%	-4%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		-4%			

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	87%	71%	16%	70%	17%
2018	88%	67%	21%	68%	20%
Compare		-1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	63%	4%	61%	6%
2018	67%	59%	8%	62%	5%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	54%	5%	57%	2%
2018	65%	54%	11%	56%	9%
Compare		-6%			

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
ELL	41	50	33	46	32	27	53				
HSP	82	64	54	62	32	17	57	87		100	93
FRL	79	67	53	61	28	13	55	86		100	92
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	8	40	46	53	40						
HSP	82	67	68	66	39	43	67	88		100	94
FRL	79	69	65	62	34	41	61	86		100	93

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
ELL		55									
HSP	81	63	53	64	41	24	54	90		100	87
FRL	77	58	53	60	42	24	55	91		99	84

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	66
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	90
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	729
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
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

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	66
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 students in the lower 25th percentile in both ELA and Mathematics showed the lowest performance in achievement from the 2018 to the 2019 school year. In 2018, 67% of Students in the Lowest 25th Percentile in ELA achieved mastery while in 2019 only 51% of students achieved mastery. In 2018, 43% of students in the Lowest 25th Percentile in Mathematics achieved mastery while in 2019 only 15% of students achieved mastery. 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 students in the lower 25th percentile in both ELA and Mathematics showed the greatest decline in achievement from the 2018 to the 2019 school year. In 2018, 67% of Students in the Lowest 25th Percentile in ELA achieved mastery while in 2019 only 51% of students achieved mastery. In 2018, 43% of students in the Lowest 25th Percentile in Mathematics achieved mastery while in 2019 only 15% of students achieved mastery. 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 students in the lower 25th percentile in Mathematics showed the greatest gap in achievement from the 2018 to the 2019 school year compared to the state. In 2018, 43% of students in the Lowest 25th Percentile in Mathematics achieved mastery while in 2019 only 15% of students achieved mastery. The state had a mastery percentage of 45%. 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 Principals 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 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:	Judith Marty (jmarty@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/ USATEST Prep 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.

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.