Mater Palms Academy

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mater Palms Academy

401 S POINCIANA BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34746

www.materpalms.com

Demographics

Principal: Jorge Rivas

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2017

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	82%
2020-21 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola County School Board.

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 Palms Academy

401 S POINCIANA BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34746

www.materpalms.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	71%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	78%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola County School Board.

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.

Together, we will cultivate a positive, dynamic environment of RESPECT and learning.

Challenges will be accepted and OVERCOME with integrity, knowing we can ACCOMPLISH any goal.

We will RISE to be active, empathetic scholars and leaders who impact the world in a positive way.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We resolve to enrich, engage, and support all students through their educational journey.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cueto, Monica	Principal	Oversee the school's day-to-day operations, including handling disciplinary matters, conducting classroom observations, managing a budget, and hiring teachers and other personnel. Develops and monitors the SIP. Logistics, schedules, teacher and staff evaluations, and public relations are also major responsibilities.
Sanchez, Erika	Assistant Principal	Supports in the principal overseeing all functions of the school, including handling discipline matters and leading schoolwide instruction through classroom walkthroughs, feedback, and professional development. Assists the principal in developing and monitoring the implementation of the SIP.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/31/2017, Jorge Rivas

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.*
1

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.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

873

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	104	105	94	103	99	100	98	83	86	0	0	0	0	872
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/31/2021

2020-21 - 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	100	109	106	93	95	89	83	85	81	0	0	0	0	841
Attendance below 90 percent	28	20	11	12	14	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	0	15	19	17	15	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	20	20	14	0	0	0	0	67

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	100	109	106	93	95	89	83	85	81	0	0	0	0	841
Attendance below 90 percent	28	20	11	12	14	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	0	15	19	17	15	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	20	20	14	0	0	0	0	67

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				58%	56%	61%	54%	58%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				73%	57%	59%	57%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				76%	55%	54%	39%	52%	52%
Math Achievement				63%	52%	62%	57%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains				79%	55%	59%	56%	54%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69%	49%	52%	50%	50%	52%
Science Achievement				44%	49%	56%	41%	54%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				83%	75%	78%		71%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	58%	51%	7%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	68%	51%	17%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	48%	-1%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
06	2021					
	2019	55%	48%	7%	54%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	57%	47%	10%	52%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2021					
	2019	53%	49%	4%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	74%	53%	21%	64%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	48%	2%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
06	2021					
	2019	63%	45%	18%	55%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
07	2021					
	2019	64%	30%	34%	54%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
08	2021					
	2019	19%	47%	-28%	46%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	40%	45%	-5%	53%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	44%	42%	2%	48%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	62%	-62%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	79%	73%	6%	71%	8%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	62%	-62%	70%	-70%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	92%	49%	43%	61%	31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	44%	-44%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

I-Ready

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	96/29%	96/32%	96/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	96/30%	96/33%	96/38%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	98/40%	98/52%	98/63%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	98/26%	97/38%	98/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	86/52%	86/64%	86/73%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	85/26%	86/40%	86/62%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	89/28%	89/38%	90/40%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	89/17%	89/33%	90/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79/28%	79/44%	80/48%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79/29%	78/38%	80/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	77/32%	78/35%	78/40%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	76/34%	78/33%	77/40%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	83/36%	80/44%	81/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	83/30%	80/34%	79/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	76/51%	77/49%	77/64%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	4/22%		
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	76/37%	47/28%	57/32%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	5	40	40	11	21	27	9				
ELL	41	56	67	40	45	50	25	48	53		
BLK	40	39		27	32		25				
HSP	47	59	68	42	40	43	32	57	69		
MUL	47	45		59	36						
WHT	68	68		59	37		60	71	71		
FRL	47	55	58	38	32	31	33	59	64		
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	6	54		25	69						
ELL	46	72	73	60	73	61	34	79			
BLK	53	67		29	64						

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
HSP	59	77	80	64	78	68	45	83	91		
MUL	60			80							
WHT	55	58		65	91		37	92			
FRL	56	71	78	59	72	63	35	75			
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	20			20							
ELL	30	38	36	36	42	30					
HSP	52	55	38	58	53	50	36				
WHT	65			59							
FRL	53	58	46	57	53	44	41				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	533
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

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%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	47
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The Science component of student data showed the lowest
performance was in the area of Science. Students in 5th grade and 8th grade performed
at a proficiency level of 32% and 13% respectively. The factors that contributed to last
year's low performance was due to a need to provide teachers with strategies for
formative assessments to determine mastery of standards and ensure that pacing and
standards are taught at grade level.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

In comparison to the 2019 FSA data, our student showed the greatest need for
improvement in science. With our 8th grade only 13% proficient.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

This past year, distance learning was a large factor in student growth. Students were
often learning from home in environments that were not conducive to learning. Also,
there were students where learning digitally was not the best learning platform for them
to learn. Many struggling students hid behind the computer and used it to avoid work
when it got hard. Teachers were also not able to make the same kind of connections with
the virtual students as they were with the students in the classroom. The students experienced
learning gaps in
their instruction. In order to combat the learning loss, we will hone in on small group
instruction, targeted intervention, implement acceleration tutoring and closely monitor instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The biggest area of improvement was ELA Learning Gains. We implemented
new tutoring and progress monitoring initiatives to support students learning progression
and increase gains across areas.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Strong alignment of instruction and common assessments with ELA standards,
effective systems and structures to provide support to students, such as small group instruction,
intervention and tutoring, and continued analysis of ELA data to provide
support to students in areas of need and to adjust instruction are all contributing factors
to this improvement.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

In order to accelerate learning, teachers will need to work collaboratively in their
professional learning teams to provide lessons that continuously identify accurate critical
content through the use of appropriately scaffolded lessons, ask questions that require

inferencing about new content, examine similarities and differences through interactive notebooks, anchor charts, and graphic organizers, in addition to providing structured practice for fluency to develop automaticity and revise knowledge. Teachers will engage students in explaining and defending conclusions through problem-solving lessons.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will participate in professional development to learn how to analyze data and make data-informed decisions to accelerate learning. Teachers will also receive professional development on engagement strategies and the High Yield Instructional Strategies.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Students will have the opportunity to participate in tutoring giving opportunities for students to work with teachers to clarify critical content and practice skills and processes. Students will be able to use this time
for remediation support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The goal will be to increase learning gains from the current 38% to 50% by focusing on the use of content glossaries and performance assessment math instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	All student achievement in math will increase to50% from the 2021 score of 42% as measured by the Mathematics Florida Statewide Assessment (FSA) administered in May.
Monitoring:	Create formative assessments, analyze their data appropriately, and then use their data to drive the instructional math model, student achievement will increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Erika Sanchez (esanchez@materpalms.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that the only way to close the wide gap of math deficiencies is to move away from whole group instruction and use data to target all elements of instruction The analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will receive professional development on i-Ready and usage requirements
2. Staff will teach problem-solving strategies and high-order thinking concepts through the delivery of
differentiated mathematics lessons.

3. Staff will assist students in monitoring and reflecting on applying mathematical practices. Staff will expose
students to multiple problem-solving strategies, including visual representations in their
work.
4. Staff will provide supplemental learning opportunities to students who are identified as not proficient in
mathematics or who are identified as at-risk of becoming non-proficient in mathematics.
5. Staff will develop outcomes representing high expectations and rigor that are connected to a sequence of
learning.
6. Students will be cognitively engaged in instruction using high-quality questioning and discussion techniques,
supported be quality feedback and the ability to self-assess progress related to the learning outcome.
7. Teachers will utilize formative assessments to monitor student learning and provide feedback.

Person Responsible   Erika Sanchez (esanchez@materpalms.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2018-19 and 2019-2020 school data, Science achievement is below the state average of 56%. The goal is to increase to 56% to meet the state average by focusing on vocabulary development and inquiry thinking.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase science to 56% as measured by the FSSA given in May.
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	The science curriculum must be made relevant to students by framing lessons in contexts that give facts meaning, teach concepts that matter in students' lives and provide opportunities for solving complex problems.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who manipulate scientific ideas using hands-on/minds-on strategies and activities are more successful than peers who are taught by teachers relying primarily on lectures and the textbook

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will attain and break down achievement data from district assessments during weekly common
planning PLC.
2. Science teachers participate in the PLC process weekly to ensure content and pacing and reteaching of standards.
3. Teachers will participate in PD that will AVID strategies including Kagan, WICOR, Cornell notes, and
interactive notebooks.
4. Teachers will learn and implement standards-based stations and implement differentiated instruction as an
instructional strategy to break down student data and content mastery.
5. ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialists.
6. Teachers will provide individual student data chats.
7. The administration will provide professional development sessions to teachers as they request it and the
need arises.
8. Teacher will provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction based on grade-level standards data, student tracking,
collaborative planning, and data analysis.

Person Responsible	Erika Sanchez (esanchez@materpalms.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Ensure high levels of learning for all students in literacy. Rationale Literacy is the foundation for all instruction. An explicit action plan must be in place in order to continue developing education as a whole.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA achievement will increase by 3 percent. ELA gains will increase by 3 percent ELA Low 25 will increase by 6 percent
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that targeted instruction, data driven instruction and meeting students where they are in the most effective way to close the achievement gap. In order for all students to make gains and become proficient, teachers must use individual student data to pinpoint deficiencies regardless of achievement level and use that data to drive instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Specific instructional supports intended to scaffold emergent bilinguals' oral production of explanations facilitated or constrained students' attempts to explain. Findings demonstrate that explanations were very rarely produced, and when they were produced, the explanations were not particularly informative. It is founded that the teachers' attempts to support emergent bilingual talk via sentence starters, guiding questions and rephrasing questions inadvertently undermined the students' attempts to explain (Rodriguez-Mojica, 2019)

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to prior years' data, Students with Disabilities (SWD) had low performance across all subject areas.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2021-2022 school year, at least 41% of Students with Disabilities (SWD) will make a learning gain in ELA and Math.
Monitoring:	Data meetings will be conducted quarterly with all grade levels and will focus on subgroup and individual student progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Erika Sanchez (esanchez@materpalms.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated professional development and specific research-based curriculum/strategies for instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The work of our Professional Learning Community is based around continuous improvement and determining how to adjust instructional practices to obtain better learning outcomes. Teachers will be given new, different and differentiated training, and will work together to shift their instruction based on student need.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School-based Leadership Team (SBLT) will provide details of all IndividualEducation Plans (IEPs), 504 Plans, Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Plans, Health
Plans, Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs) to teachers during pre-planning.
2.. The SBLT will train teachers on accommodations, interventions, and documentation as
related to those plans.
3. Professional development will be provided to train ESE teachers on best practices for
Support Facilitation and Quality Individual Education Plan (IEP) writing.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Mater Palms Academy reported 0.4 incidents per 100 students This rate is less than the Statewide combination school rate of 1.6 incidents oper 100 students

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.

The school engages families, students. and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction and hold staff responsible for implementing any changes. It frequently communicates high expectations for all students. Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building.• Student work is displayed throughout the school. A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created.
Our school strives to involve all parents in the planning, review, and improvement of Title I programs and our Parent and Family Engagement Plan. All parents are invited to attend meetings regarding the development of the required plan through flyers, school marquees, and other communication tools. Parents are asked for their input on activities and training provided by the school. The school uses the notes from the group discussion to guide writing the plan.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The administration Team, Teachers and Support Staff, Students, Parents, and community members play a large role in our school's success each stakeholder holds an important part. Our SAC members have a great responsibility in support of school culture that is established by our Administrative Team and our Teachers, Students, Parents, and community members promote and enhance our culture.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup:	$0.00
		Total:	$176,482.99