

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Mater Grove Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

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 (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	19%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students 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](#).

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

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	<p>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.</p>
Toledo, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	<p>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.</p>
Paz, Raquel	Instructional Coach	<p>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.</p>
Andreu, Niurka	Instructional Coach	<p>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.</p>
Diaz, Samantha	Instructional Coach	<p>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.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Instructional coaches meet often with teachers to provide feedback on the progress being made by 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 (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	19%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students 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	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	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	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	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 additional 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% achievement 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
			<i>Notes: EESER funding</i>			
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