

School District of Osceola County, FL

Mater Academy At St Cloud



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

Mater Academy At St Cloud

1925 NORA TYSON RD, St. Cloud, FL 34771

www.materstcloud.com

Demographics

Principal: Alexandra Castillo

Start Date for this Principal: 7/6/2020

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)	71%
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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: No Grade 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Mater Academy At St Cloud

1925 NORA TYSON RD, St. Cloud, FL 34771

www.materstcloud.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	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	78%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade		C	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.

The Mission of Mater Academy St. Cloud is to seek:

- Meaningful achievement of
- Academics facilitated by
- Teachers, administrators, parents and the community
- Enabling students to become confident, self-directed and
- Responsible life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Mater Academy St. Cloud our students SOAR to Success. Our students
Strive for success,
Own their choices,
Aspire to lead, and
Respect others.

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
Castillo, Alexandra	Principal	
Machin, Maria	Instructional Coach	
Hainlin, Marianna	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/6/2020, Alexandra Castillo

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

19

Total number of students enrolled at the school

380

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

6

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

12

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	54	43	44	35	44	49	44	48	18	0	0	0	0	379
Attendance below 90 percent	24	13	12	8	18	14	10	17	9	0	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	10	15	15	16	3	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	16	13	14	19	4	0	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	10	10	15	15	16	3	0	0	0	0	69

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	1	1	6	7	4	9	4	0	0	0	0	32

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	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
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

Thursday 9/16/2021

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	28	37	23	32	38	28	39	17	24	0	0	0	0	266
Attendance below 90 percent	2	14	0	8	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	3	5	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4	6	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	0	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	

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	28	37	23	32	38	28	39	17	24	0	0	0	0	266
Attendance below 90 percent	2	14	0	8	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	3	5	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4	6	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	0	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	

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				50%	56%	61%		58%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				43%	57%	59%		58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					55%	54%		52%	52%
Math Achievement				40%	52%	62%		52%	61%
Math Learning Gains				61%	55%	59%		54%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					49%	52%		50%	52%
Science Achievement					49%	56%		54%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					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	50%	51%	-1%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	51%	-13%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	48%	-8%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
06	2021					
	2019	47%	48%	-1%	54%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
08	2021					

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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	62%	-31%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	53%	-15%	64%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	48%	-8%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
06	2021					
	2019	41%	45%	-4%	55%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	0%	45%	-45%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Progress monitoring tool(s) used to compile the below grade in grades Kindergarten through 8th grade is i-Ready.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28		
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21		
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23		
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8		
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49		
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13		
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30		
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7		
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28		
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19		
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22		
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19		
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
Civics	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28		
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12		
	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	7										
ELL	25	48	47	24	33	36	6				
BLK	20										
HSP	37	48	50	24	27	24	16	83			
WHT	32			29							
FRL	36	44	50	23	20	36	26				
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	30			10							
HSP	52	44		33	56						
WHT	40			40							
FRL	35	47		30	53						

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

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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	379
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	4
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	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	20
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	42
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	31
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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 trends across all tested grade levels are a deficit in foundational skills in math fluency as well phonics.

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

According to our BOY diagnostic data for mathematics in grades k-8 our current proficiency is 13% with the weakest domain being numbers and operations at 16% proficiency. This data is consistent with the 2019 state assessment data.

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

The contributing factors are the instructional gaps and loss of instructional time that has decreased the math fluency in all grade levels. Action steps that are in place are the use of Reflex Math to increase math fluency, targeted foundational math tutoring in the fall as well as targeted math intervention time in the master schedule to increase math proficiency.

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

The data component that increased and showed the most improvement in state assessment was learning gains for lowest 25th percentile.

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

There was a focus on developing our instructional staff strengthen their reading strategies via reading endorsement classes and reading endorsement test prep.

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

In order to accelerate learning we will implement a universal reading and mathematics intervention time for grades k-2 and grades 3-5 in order to facilitate and collaborate targeted MTSS intervention as well as acceleration.

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.

We will provide our teachers with differentiated instruction professional development for both mathematics and reading that not only remediate but accelerate learning for our students. In addition, our teachers will and have begun the Thinking Maps initiative to problem solve, conceptualize and accelerate learning.

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

Additional services that will be implemented are an additional ESE teacher to service our students, a Thinking Maps coach who will work with our instructional staff to continue developing the implementation of Thinking Maps in all content areas, as well as incorporating universal intervention times for reading and mathematics.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2020-2021 state assessment data, ELA proficiency was at 38% which is below the state average of 52%; the district average is 46%. The goal is to increase to 56% while focusing on ELL, ESE, Black, Hispanic and FRL subgroups.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome for the 2021-2022 school year is to increase school ELA proficiency by 8% which will match the district average.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored via progress monitoring, data chats, and observation walk through tools.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks; Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners to differentiate/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Great leaders understand that teachers know what their students- and what they themselves- need to succeed. When teachers are involved in examining data and making important decisions based on data that inform how they improve their school, students, leadership teams can ensure that everyone in the building is focused on the core business of the school- improving student achievement and learning outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

- Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction.
- Utilize an adaptive, computer- based program (i-Ready ELA, using AP reports and instructional usage reports with a target of 45 minutes a week) as one way to differentiate instruction and monitor student progress.
- Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth.
- Use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention, and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance.

Person Responsible Alexandra Castillo (acastillo@materstcloud.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2020-2021 school data, math proficiency was at 27% which is below the state average of 47% and the district average is 37%. The goal is to increase our school average to 40% while focusing on all ELL, ESE, Black, Hispanic and FRL subgroups.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome for the 2021-2022 school year is to increase school Math proficiency by 13% on state assessment data.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored via progress monitoring, data chats, and observation walk through tools.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Alexandra Castillo (acastillo@materstcloud.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/ scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

- Regularly assess and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions.
- Teachers monitor and provide feedback to students to support learning.

Person Responsible Alexandra Castillo (acastillo@materstcloud.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2020-2021 school data, science proficiency was at 24% which is below the state average of 46%, the district average is 39%. The goal is to increase our school average to 40% while focusing on all ELL, ESE, Black, Hispanic and FRL subgroups.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome for the 2021-2022 school year is to increase school Science proficiency by 16%.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored via progress monitoring, data chats, and observation walk through tools.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Alexandra Castillo (acastillo@materstcloud.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks.

Action Steps to Implement

- Teachers collaborate to select and implement rigorous tasks aligned to each standard.
- Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth. Administrators regularly observe science lessons and provide feedback.

Person Responsible: Alexandra Castillo (acastillo@materstcloud.com)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The leadership team

Measurable Outcome:

The goal is for the leadership team to meet with each teacher 4 times a quarter to provide specific teacher feedback.

Monitoring:**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

1. The school leadership team will work with the Parent as Liaisons (PALS) to put together rewards for students with perfect attendance on a quarterly basis. The leadership team will recognize classes who show improvement in their overall attendance throughout the year.

2. To address the school-wide improvement priority of professional development on explicit standards based instruction, the leadership team will conduct regular PLC and follow the coaching model with both new and veteran teachers.

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.

it is important to recognize the outstanding things that our school community accomplishes, both inside and out of our buildings and foster a consistent, shared vision for our school. As a Leader in Me school we build our school's culture, leadership and academics on the guiding principles of the 7 habits of highly effective people. We do a monthly focus of habits and highlight those students who modeled those positive leadership habits. Additionally our goal is that all staff foster and forward positive relationships with colleagues, students, and families.

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

Our stakeholder groups include administrators, teachers, students, the families of our students, community volunteers, school-board members, our local police department and business partners. Each stakeholder group plays a vital role in promoting a positive culture and environment. Our administrators, teachers, and students work at the heart of the culture by modeling leadership qualities into all aspects of their school day. Our students' families are encouraged to not only participate but also lead and organize positive school events for our school community. Stakeholders are further encouraged to join PALS (Parents as Liaisons) and SAC (School Advisory Committee) to take an active part in molding a positive culture and environment.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00