

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Mater International Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Mater International Academy

3405 NW 27TH AVE, Miami, FL 33142

www.materinternational.com

Demographics

Principal: Olga Camarena

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	95%
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 Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Mater International Academy

3405 NW 27TH AVE, Miami, FL 33142

www.materinternational.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	97%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	100%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	B	B	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 International Academy is to develop the intellectual, social, and bilingual skills of its students in a nurturing and safe environment, through innovative and creative teaching methods, thus producing lifelong learners who respect diversity.

.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision of Mater International Academy is to provide students a viable educational choice that offers an innovative, rigorous, and seamless college preparatory curriculum, providing Mater students, at every level from PK-12th grade, with a competitive advantage against their contemporaries. To that end, Mater International Academy strive to:

- create a thirst for knowledge in all disciplines;
- kindle the art of thinking and serve as a springboard for lifelong learning; and
- deliver 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
Camarena, Olga	Principal	<p>Principal will meet with the school leadership team on a weekly basis in order to discuss any updates/changes to academic programs. Ms. Camarena will serve as an instructional leader by guiding her staff to become active members in the decision making regarding student achievement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Overall day-to-day school operations -Curriculum Decisions -Purchasing Decisions -Facilities Enhancements -School Budget/approves all purchases -SACS/AdvancED -School Wellness Plans -School Improvement Plan (SIP) -Parent concerns -Building maintenance -Faculty meetings -Crisis management -Fire Alarm Contact -Annual School Accountability Report -Personnel Issues Evaluations/Supervision -IPGP - Title I Program requirements -Conflict Resolution -Discipline -EESAC -Student Retentions -Threat Assessment Team -FSSA Safety and Security -SESIR
Gonzalez, Dulce	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Chair will be attending the district meetings and professional developments. She will relay the information to teachers and administrators after the meetings.
Crossett, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Chair will be attending the district meetings and professional developments. She will relay the information to teachers and administrators after the meetings.
Torres, Jessica	Instructional Coach	<p>Lead Teacher and Reading Coach will be attending the district meetings and professional developments. She will relay the information to teachers and administrators after the meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Curriculum Planning/Data Driven/Evidence Based -Professional Development per subject -Analyze data and diagnose student needs per grade levels -Guide grade level planning and meetings -Conduct classroom walkthroughs of all teachers and offer support where needed and students, coaching -Model engaging, standard-based lessons as needed

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Collaborate with grade level and address needs -Guidance with instructional resources -Attend district and Mater, Inc reading coaches meetings -Debrief and model new strategies -Assist administration with any request as needed -I-Ready Program- Reading & Math -Book Fair School Events -Mater Spelling Bee -Master Schedules -Member of Threat Assessment Team -Test Chair

Boyd, Donna	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Chair will be attending the district meetings and professional developments. She will relay the information to teachers and administrators after the meetings.
----------------	------------------	--

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/15/2016, Olga Camarena

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

9

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	95%

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 Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	36	26	41	34	32	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	3	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	1	3	0	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	1	8	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	

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	1	6	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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 9/8/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	10	24	4	13	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	3	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	10	24	4	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	3	11	4	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	10	24	4	13	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	3	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	10	24	4	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	3	11	4	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	54%	62%	57%	0%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	62%	58%	0%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	58%	53%	0%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	69%	63%	0%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains	44%	66%	62%	0%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	55%	51%	0%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	55%	53%	0%	52%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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	51%	60%	-9%	58%	-7%
	2018	50%	61%	-11%	57%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	64%	-6%	58%	0%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	67%	-5%	62%	0%
	2018	75%	67%	8%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	69%	-6%	64%	-1%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

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	51			63							
HSP	57	59		65	47						
FRL	54	56		61	44						
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	35			71							
HSP	48			76							
FRL	50			75							

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
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	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	273
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
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	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	
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	57
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	55
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 which showed the lowest performance was Math Achievement. The contributing factors to last year's low performance came from many factors which attributed to the decline in Math

Achievement. The primary reason which contributed to the decline in Math Achievement was based on student foundational deficiencies.

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

The data component which showed the greatest decline from the previous school year was Math achievement. Math achievement in 2018 was 75% and dropped to 61% in 2019. Factors which attributed to the decline include low foundational deficiencies, staff turnover, and a high level of English language learners.

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 which had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Math Learning Gains. The state average for 2019 was 62% and the school average was 44%. The contributing factors include the decline in Math Achievement. With 61% of students achieving proficiency in Math learning gains from previous school year also declined. Differentiated instruction was provided however a more in depth analysis will be conducted to ensure the students are receiving differentiated instruction based on their actual foundational deficiencies.

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

The data component which showed the most improvement was ELA Achievement. In 2018 the ELA achievement was 50% and in 2019 went up to 54%. Factors which attributed to the increase was TIER II intervention and differentiated instruction by the teachers and the lead teacher providing pull out services.

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

The two potential areas of concern according to the EWS data are the number of Level 1 students on the statewide assessment and the number of retainees. The number of retained students for 2019 is 6 and the number of students that are presently level 1 is a total of 11. These indicators present a greater challenge not only for the classroom teacher to differentiate instruction but also to ensure all resources needed are provided to the students with fidelity.

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

1. 1. Math Learning Gain
2. Math Proficiency
3. Retained Students making learning gains
4. Students with a Level 1 making adequate learning gains
5. Reading Learning Gains.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on 2019 data, ELA scores were at a overall 54% student achievement and we have identified it as a critical need for improvement and area of focus for the 20-21 school year. Teachers will target reading and language arts strategies. Students will have numerous opportunities to practice targeted activities through direct and small group instruction in order to improve academic achievement levels.
Measurable Outcome:	Teachers will incorporate additional reading and language arts strategies skills in order to increase ELA achievement by 2% . Students will have numerous opportunities to engage in targeted based ELA activities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Torres (jtorres@materinternationalacademy.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	IReady ELA instruction will be used to target individual instruction in every grade level.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady is an evidence based program that will ensure that the students are working within their individual academic level. Additionally, each student will be able to work towards their growth target to achieve higher skills in reading and language arts..

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly walkthroughs and lesson overview will be conducted in order to monitor successful instructional delivery.

Person Responsible Jessica Torres (jtorres@materinternationalacademy.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on 2019 data, math scores were at a overall 44% student learning gains and we have identified it as a critical need for improvement and area of focus for the 20-21 school year. Teachers will target math. Students will have numerous opportunities to practice targeted activities through direct and small group instruction in order to improve academic achievement levels and learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	Teachers will incorporate additional math foundational skills in order to increase math achievement by 2% . Students will have numerous opportunities to engage in targeted based math activities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Torres (jtorres@materinternationalacademy.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	IReady Math instruction will be used to target individual instruction in every grade level.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady is an evidence based program that will ensure that the students are working within their individual academic level. Additionally, each student will be able to work towards their growth target to achieve higher skills in Math.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly walkthroughs and lesson overview will be conducted in order to monitor successful instructional delivery.

Person Responsible Jessica Torres (jtorres@materinternationalacademy.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school data clearly indicates a deficit in Math Proficiency and Math Learning Gains. It is critical this year to ensure differentiated instruction is taking place not only in the classroom but also to develop a pull out system where the students are receiving additional intervention in areas of deficiency in Math. The data analysis will also need to be constant ensuring data is individualized to the students. The data chats will need to occur on a bi-weekly basis and the staff will need to remediate according to student needs. The teachers will be provided with I-Ready Teacher toolbox as an additional resource as well as Digital Coach/Performance Coach for remediation. It will be critical to ensure student data is being analyzed to ensure we are meeting individual student goals.

Math pull out groups will also need to occur with fidelity in order to target specific student learning deficiencies in foundational skills. I-Ready will be used to assign students specific lessons according to their foundational deficiencies. The teachers will need to create student groups via I-ready to ensure target instruction via I-Ready.

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.

Our goal is to increase the percent of parents involved in school activities to 71%. Limited knowledge of the English language is a barrier in providing knowledge of activities. Communication will be sent in English and Spanish for all parent activities. Activities will be conducted in both languages. Modes of communication have been expanded to include school-wide mass text messaging through school messenger service to remind parents of important information and upcoming events, both in English and Spanish. Principal will monitor implementation and review sign in sheets to determine the number of parents attending school or community events for effectiveness. Progress will be determined by analyzing sign in sheets for parent participation.

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: ELA				\$6,798.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	3000 - Mater International Academy	Title, I Part A		\$6,798.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$6,798.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	3000 - Mater International Academy	Title, I Part A		\$6,798.00
Total:						\$13,596.00