# Mater Grove Academy

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
students
ambitious
mission
school improvement
family and community involvement
striving
achievement
relationships
teaching
success
areas of focus
instruction
resources
supportive environment
growth
needs assessment
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning

# 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Mater Grove Academy

### 2805 SW 32ND AVE, Miami, FL 33133

### [ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

## Principal: Sheila Gonzalez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Combination School<br>KG-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 19% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an<br>asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged<br>Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (63%)<br><br>2017-18: A (66%)<br><br>2016-17: A (62%)<br><br>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** | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#). | |

## School Board Approval

N/A

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

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

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

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Table of Contents

## Mater Grove Academy

### 2805 SW 32ND AVE, Miami, FL 33133

[ no web address on file ]

### 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 | No | 60% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | Yes | 96% |

### School Grades History

| Year | 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.**

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

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

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

## School Leadership Team

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

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

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|-------|-------------------------------|
| | | Instructional<br>coaches meet often with teachers to provide feedback on the progress being made by<br>their respective students. |
| Suarez, Alain | Teacher, K-12 | Assist the Principal and Assistant Principal via Academic Advisement period in order to ensure that the students internalize the school's mission and the values for academic excellence and achievement, and personal and social development and growth. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Friday 7/1/2011, Sheila Gonzalez

**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**

63

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Combination School<br>KG-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 19% |
| **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>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |

| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (63%) |
|---|---|
| | 2017-18: A (66%) |
| | 2016-17: A (62%) |
| | 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 | 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 | 144 | 129 | 141 | 147 | 139 | 130 | 132 | 113 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1202 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 14 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 37 | 30 | 16 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 117 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 25 | 18 | 24 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 |

**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 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |

**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 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 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 9/1/2020

**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 | 127 | 126 | 144 | 138 | 126 | 129 | 114 | 134 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1118 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 19 | 13 | 21 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 1 | 6 | 22 | 2 | 23 | 39 | 45 | 33 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 20 | 18 | 33 | 31 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142 |

**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 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 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 | 127 | 126 | 144 | 138 | 126 | 129 | 114 | 134 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1118 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 19 | 13 | 21 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 1 | 6 | 22 | 2 | 23 | 39 | 45 | 33 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 20 | 18 | 33 | 31 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142 |

**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 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 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 | 71% | 63% | 61% | 68% | 59% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 64% | 61% | 59% | 65% | 59% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 57% | 54% | 45% | 55% | 51% |
| Math Achievement | 70% | 67% | 62% | 72% | 62% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 60% | 63% | 59% | 60% | 60% | 56% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 50% | 56% | 52% | 48% | 52% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 55% | 56% | 56% | 54% | 53% | 53% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 81% | 80% | 78% | 93% | 75% | 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 | 69% | 60% | 9% | 58% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 74% | 61% | 13% | 57% | 17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 04 | 2019 | 70% | 64% | 6% | 58% | 12% |
| | 2018 | 70% | 60% | 10% | 56% | 14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 61% | 60% | 1% | 56% | 5% |
| | 2018 | 68% | 59% | 9% | 55% | 13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 82% | 58% | 24% | 54% | 28% |
| | 2018 | 49% | 53% | -4% | 52% | -3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 33% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 14% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 68% | 56% | 12% | 52% | 16% |
| | 2018 | 70% | 54% | 16% | 51% | 19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 19% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 66% | 60% | 6% | 56% | 10% |
| | 2018 | 71% | 59% | 12% | 58% | 13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 03 | 2019 | 80% | 67% | 13% | 62% | 18% |
| | 2018 | 84% | 67% | 17% | 62% | 22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 66% | 69% | -3% | 64% | 2% |
| | 2018 | 64% | 68% | -4% | 62% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -18% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 53% | 65% | -12% | 60% | -7% |
| | 2018 | 74% | 66% | 8% | 61% | 13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -21% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 78% | 58% | 20% | 55% | 23% |
| | 2018 | 67% | 56% | 11% | 52% | 15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 73% | 53% | 20% | 54% | 19% |
| | 2018 | 70% | 52% | 18% | 54% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 29% | 40% | -11% | 46% | -17% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|------|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -41% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 05 | 2019 | 44% | 53% | -9% | 53% | -9% |
| | 2018 | 60% | 56% | 4% | 55% | 5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -16% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 71% | 43% | 28% | 48% | 23% |
| | 2018 | 49% | 44% | 5% | 50% | -1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 22% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 11% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|------|--------|----------|-------------------------------|-------|----------------------------|
| **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School Minus District** | **State** | **School Minus State** |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| **CIVICS EOC** | | | | | |
| **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School Minus District** | **State** | **School Minus State** |
| 2019 | 79% | 73% | 6% | 71% | 8% |
| 2018 | 87% | 72% | 15% | 71% | 16% |
| Compare | | -8% | | | |
| **HISTORY EOC** | | | | | |
| **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School Minus District** | **State** | **School Minus State** |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| **ALGEBRA EOC** | | | | | |
| **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School Minus District** | **State** | **School Minus State** |
| 2019 | 83% | 63% | 20% | 61% | 22% |
| 2018 | 60% | 59% | 1% | 62% | -2% |
| Compare | | 23% | | | |

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

## Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 42 | 57 | 45 | 45 | 61 | 42 | | | | | |
| ELL | 61 | 64 | 54 | 66 | 57 | 42 | 41 | 77 | 50 | | |
| BLK | 39 | 33 | | 28 | 33 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 72 | 65 | 49 | 72 | 61 | 49 | 54 | 81 | 74 | | |
| WHT | 83 | 59 | | 75 | 65 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 66 | 61 | 50 | 62 | 49 | 39 | 44 | 65 | 67 | | |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 33 | 69 | 80 | 48 | 63 | 40 | | | | | |
| ELL | 52 | 65 | 74 | 62 | 52 | 45 | 47 | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 69 | | 36 | 56 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 69 | 66 | 69 | 74 | 63 | 45 | 58 | 87 | 59 | | |
| WHT | 69 | | | 75 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 60 | 69 | 73 | 64 | 58 | 46 | 45 | 81 | 65 | | |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 45 | | | 45 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 54 | 58 | 52 | 57 | 67 | 53 | 23 | | | | |
| HSP | 69 | 67 | 46 | 73 | 63 | 50 | 53 | 93 | | | |
| WHT | 75 | | | 75 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 54 | 64 | 44 | 57 | 55 | 43 | 30 | | | | |

## 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 | 63 |
| 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 | 62 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 631 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 48 |
| 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 | 33 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 64 |
| 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 | |
|---|---|
| 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 | 71 |
| 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 | 56 |
| 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 ELA Lowest 25th percentile. Standard specific remediation to students in ELA presented a difficulty due to inconsistent attendance in after school and Saturday tutoring due to parental obligation and ability to provide transportation. The limited access for home use of supplemental instructional programs with fidelity caused a lapse in students being able to review the concepts assigned by their teacher.

The school also noted that many students struggled with prior knowledge and were consistently needing to reteach lessons to select students.

**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 from the prior year was ELA Lowest 25th percentile. Additional targeted interventions must be provided in order to ensure the closure of learning gaps. Standard specific remediation to students in ELA presented a difficulty due to inconsistent attendance in after school and Saturday tutoring due to parental

obligation and ability to provide transportation.

Low percentages of i-Ready usage was noted to be a factor towards students not mastering the concepts assigned by their teachers.

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

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was ELA Lowest 25th percentile by 6 percentage points. Standard specific remediation to students in ELA presented a difficulty due to inconsistent attendance in after school and Saturday tutoring due to parental obligation and ability to provide transportation.

Low percentages of i-Ready usage was noted to be a factor towards students not mastering the concepts assigned by their teachers.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was ELA Achievement. The actions taken during the 2019-2020 school year were the intervention and teaching strategies implemented in the classroom to engage students in learning, mandatory after school and Saturday tutoring, and added support from the Lead teachers and curriculum specialist while planning lessons tailored to target this specific area.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic we were not able to take assessments and receive new data points. Our school transitioned to Remote Live Instruction and continued providing students with a rewarding and structured learning for students in Grades K-8.

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

Areas of concern would be Level 1 Statewide Achievement in ELA & Math in Grades 5 & 8

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

1. ELA Lowest 25th percentile
2. Sub Group Black/African American Students
3. Math Gains
4. Science Achievement
5. ELA Learning Gains

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| **#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching** |
|---|

| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | The position of Curriculum Coach was created in order to provide our teachers with additonal support. Ms. Diaz a veteran teacher was pulled to provide teachers with guidance during grade level meetings, instructional planning meetings, and by pulling students for small group instruction. |
|---|---|
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Our goal is to have a 70% acheivement level in the "ELA Lowest 25 Percentile" reporting category. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Samantha Diaz (sdiaz@matergroveacademy.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Ms. Diaz will monitor student progress using i-Ready reports and class assessment achievement. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | iReady and Ready are backed by timely research conducted in diverse educational settings. This research meets the criteria for "evidence-based" as defined by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), qualifying these programs for School Improvement funding. |

| **Action Steps to Implement** |
|---|

Mrs. Toledo our Assistant Principal, will monitor the implementation and fidelity of coaching provided by Ms.Diaz our Curriculum Coach. Coaching logs and student achievement will be reviewed on an ongoing basis.

| **Person Responsible** | Elizabeth Toledo (toledo@dadeschools.net) |
|---|---|

| #2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Federal Index - Black/African American Students was at 33%. The data was provided to us by the state and we have been classified as a TS&I school. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Our goal is to increase achievement in this ESSA subgroup to at least 43%. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Raquel Paz (934578@dadeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Ms. Paz will monitor student progress using i-Ready reports and class assessment achievement. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | iReady and Ready are backed by timely research conducted in diverse educational settings. This research meets the criteria for "evidence-based" as defined by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), qualifying these programs for School Improvement funding. |

### Action Steps to Implement

Ms. Caleo our Principal, will monitor the implementation and fidelity of monitoring provided by Mrs. Paz our Lead Teacher. i-Ready student data reports will be monitored on an ongoing basis.

| **Person Responsible** | Sheila Caleo (920148@dadeschools.net) |
|---|---|

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**For Math Gains we will use "Performance Matters" standard based assessments to target and monitor student progress.**

**For Science Achievement we have purchased "USA Test Prep" to target specific standards aligned with NGSSS.**

**For ELA Learning Gains we will continue to use i-Ready data, Ready lessons from the Teacher Toolbox, and we have also purchased "Top Score Writing" in order to address the writing portion of the FSA ELA exam.**

## 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 implements a wide variety of communication methods in order to inform parents about upcoming events. Some of these methods include: monthly school calendar (posted on school website and emailed by homeroom teacher), PALS (Parents as Liaisons) newsletters, Constant Contact emails, Shutterfly class webpages, classroom websites, Parent Academy workshops and Remind 101. Principal and Assistant Principal will monitor implementation and review sign in sheets to determine the number of parents attending school or community events for effectiveness. Teachers also use Class DOJO/ Class Tag or other messaging systems as a means of communication on a daily basis to the parents in regards to academic and behavioral progress and/or concerns.

### 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: Instructional Coaching | | | | $47,500.00 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 6000 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 5045 - Mater Grove Academy | Other | | $47,500.00 |
| | | | Notes: EESER funding | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American | | | | $29,110.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 3336 | 510-Supplies | 5045 - Mater Grove Academy | School Improvement Funds | 1200.0 | $29,110.00 |
| | | | | | Total: | $76,610.00 |