

School District of Osceola County, FL

# Mater Brighton Lakes



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>28</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>29</b> |

## Mater Brighton Lakes

3200 PLEASANT HILL RD, Kissimmee, FL 34746

<https://www.materbrightonlakes.com>

### Demographics

**Principal: Carmen Cangemi**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2021

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>KG-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 84%  |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (57%)<br>2017-18: C (52%)<br>2016-17: B (58%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |  |

\* 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>29</b> |

## Mater Brighton Lakes

3200 PLEASANT HILL RD, Kissimmee, FL 34746

<https://www.materbrightonlakes.com>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School<br>KG-8                       | Yes                    | 81%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | Yes                    | 91%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade |         | B       | B       | 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 Brighton Lakes Academy is as follows:

Lead to inspire  
Establish Relationships  
Aspire for Excellence  
Discover your Voice

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

The vision of Mater Brighton Lakes Academy is create a community of leaders and life-long learners.

### 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  |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|
| Cangemi, Carmen     | Principal              | Manages and Oversees all Operations on School Campus   |
| Moran, Tyler        | Assistant Principal    | Assists in Managing all Operations on School Campus (Safety and Security, Transportation, Secondary Scheduling, General Compliance, Grounds and Maintenance) |
| Llerena, Lizaira    | Assistant Principal    | Assists in Managing all Operations on School Campus  |
| Zilinskas, Susan    | Administrative Support | Manages special programs, grants, curriculum ordering and distribution and secondary teacher support.  |
| Rodriguez, Michelle | Administrative Support | Oversees school-wide MTSS and ESE programs, as well as all programs for K-5 students, teachers and curriculum.   |
| Nuscis, Holly       | School Counselor       | Manages secondary master schedule, dual enrollment and AP programs, and ensures students meet academic goals and graduation requirements.                    |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 8/12/2021, Carmen Cangemi

**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**

52

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,223

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

10

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

26

### 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                              | 109         | 93 | 147 | 126 | 111 | 132 | 168 | 173 | 164 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1223  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 24          | 28 | 26  | 21  | 25  | 20  | 2   | 3   | 2   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 151   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 1   | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| 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   | 27  | 26  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 53    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0   | 11  | 16  | 36  | 25  | 42  | 41  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 171   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0   | 9   | 35  | 49  | 59  | 62  | 59  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 273   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 | 9 | 19 | 36 | 24 | 36 | 32 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 156   |

**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**

Wednesday 9/15/2021

**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               | 61          | 114 | 94 | 97 | 112 | 77 | 121 | 128 | 100 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 904   |
| 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 ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0  | 9  | 9   | 23 | 15  | 19  | 23  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 98    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0  | 6  | 13  | 33 | 35  | 13  | 27  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 127   |

**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 |       |
| 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           | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2 |       |
| 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               | 61          | 114 | 94 | 97 | 112 | 77 | 121 | 128 | 100 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 904   |
| 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 ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0  | 9  | 9   | 23 | 15  | 19  | 23  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 98    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0  | 6  | 13  | 33 | 35  | 13  | 27  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 127   |

**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           | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| 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             |        |          |       | 53%    | 56%      | 61%   | 54%    | 58%      | 60%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 59%    | 57%      | 59%   | 55%    | 58%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 59%    | 55%      | 54%   | 54%    | 52%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 52%    | 52%      | 62%   | 51%    | 52%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 55%    | 55%      | 59%   | 48%    | 54%      | 58%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 45%    | 49%      | 52%   | 39%    | 50%      | 52%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 50%    | 49%      | 56%   | 50%    | 54%      | 57%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  |        |          |       | 74%    | 75%      | 78%   | 54%    | 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 | 43%    | 51%      | -8%                        | 58%   | -15%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 52%    | 51%      | 1%                         | 58%   | -6%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -43%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 54%    | 48%      | 6%                         | 56%   | -2%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -52%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                   | 2019 | 63%    | 48%      | 15%                        | 54%   | 9%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -54%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 46%    | 47%      | -1%                        | 52%   | -6%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -63%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 50%    | 49%      | 1%                         | 56%   | -6%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -46%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 40%    | 54%      | -14%                       | 62%   | -22%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 67%    | 53%      | 14%                        | 64%   | 3%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -40%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 43%    | 48%      | -5%                        | 60%   | -17%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -67%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 61%    | 45%      | 16%                        | 55%   | 6%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -43%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 50%    | 30%      | 20%                        | 54%   | -4%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -61%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 30%    | 47%      | -17%                       | 46%   | -16%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -50%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 57%    | 45%      | 12%                        | 53%   | 4%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 38%    | 42%      | -4%                        | 48%   | -10%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -57%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| <b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>  |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2021                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2019                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>CIVICS EOC</b>   |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2021                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2019                | 73%           | 73%             | 0%                           | 71%          | 2%                        |
| <b>HISTORY EOC</b>  |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2021                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2019                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>  |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2021                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2019                | 65%           | 49%             | 16%                          | 61%          | 4%                        |
| <b>GEOMETRY EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2021                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2019                |               |                 |                              |              |                           |

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

K-8th grade students will take the iReady Reading and Math Diagnostics three times per year. 3rd-8th grade students will take the NWEA MAP Growth assessment for Reading and Math three times per year. 5th and 8th grade science students will take the NWEA MAP Growth assessment for Science three times per year. Diagnostics will be conducted in September, January, and April.

| Grade 1                  |                               |      |        |        |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | 28%  | 39%    | 50%    |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 3%   | 8%     | 18%    |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 2%   | 7%     | 17%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 0%   | 1%     | 3%     |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 19%  | 28%    | 39%    |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 1%   | 6%     | 11%    |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 1%   | 5%     | 11%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 0%   | 2%     | 6%     |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |
| Grade 2                  |                               |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | 20%  | 21%    | 42%    |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 3%   | 8%     | 13%    |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 3%   | 7%     | 15%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 1%   | 2%     | 9%     |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 17%  | 12%    | 35%    |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 3%   | 2%     | 10%    |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 2%   | 2%     | 9%     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 1%   | 1%     | 11%    |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |

| Grade 3               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 31%  | 30%    | 47%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 10%  | 13%    | 21%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 7%   | 9%     | 18%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 4%   | 7%     | 14%    |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 7%   | 13%    | 40%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 1%   | 3%     | 22%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 1%   | 2%     | 12%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 1%   | 1%     | 10%    |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
| Grade 4               |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 24%  | 24%    | 22%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 7%   | 6%     | 6%     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 4%   | 5%     | 4%     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 2%   | 2%     | 2%     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 6%   | 15%    | 24%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 1%   | 4%     | 11%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0%   | 1%     | 3%     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 1%   | 2%     | 3%     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

| Grade 5               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 3%   | 5%     | 9%     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 1%   | 2%     | 4%     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0%   | 1%     | 2%     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%   | 0%     | 1%     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 5%   | 5%     | 10%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 1%   | 2%     | 4%     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 1%   | 1%     | 2%     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 1%   | 1%     | 2%     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science               | All Students               | 6%   | 8%     | 10%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 1%   | 2%     | 4%     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 1%   | 1%     | 2%     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%   | 1%     | 2%     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
| Grade 6               |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 15%  | 23%    | 25%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 3%   | 7%     | 9%     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 1%   | 1%     | 2%     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 1%   | 1%     | 2%     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 4%   | 8%     | 20%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 0%   | 2%     | 6%     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 1%   | 1%     | 1%     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 1%   | 1%     | 2%     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

| Grade 7               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 15%  | 18%    | 16%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 4%   | 5%     | 7%     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 1%   | 1%     | 2%     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 1%   | 2%     | 2%     |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 4%   | 8%     | 15%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 1%   | 1%     | 3%     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0%   | 1%     | 2%     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%   | 1%     | 2%     |
| Civics                | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 3%   | 7%     | 11%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 1%   | 2%     | 4%     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0%   | 1%     | 2%     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%   | 1%     | 1%     |



| Grade 8               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 16%  | 19%    | 24%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 3%   | 5%     | 8%     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 2%   | 5%     | 6%     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 1%   | 3%     | 7%     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 0%   | 2%     | 5%     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 0%   | 0%     | 1%     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0%   | 0%     | 1%     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%   | 0%     | 0%     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 4%   | 7%     | 13%    |
| Science               | Economically Disadvantaged | 1%   | 3%     | 8%     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 1%   | 1%     | 4%     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 1%   | 1%     | 3%     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 4%   | 7%     | 13%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 1%   | 3%     | 8%     |

## 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                                       | 6        | 11     | 18          | 9         | 15      | 29           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 34       | 39     | 48          | 28        | 23      | 23           | 20       | 6       |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 41       | 45     | 53          | 27        | 25      | 33           | 30       | 40      | 75        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 43       | 38     | 39          | 31        | 26      | 28           | 27       | 33      | 74        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 54       | 42     |             | 39        | 27      |              | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 41       | 39     | 42          | 30        | 26      | 27           | 27       | 33      | 73        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 14       | 32     | 29          | 19        | 51      | 38           | 17       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 40       | 54     | 56          | 46        | 59      | 48           | 38       | 58      |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 58       | 66     | 76          | 50        | 45      | 40           | 49       | 84      | 67        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 49       | 57     | 54          | 50        | 56      | 46           | 47       | 68      | 55        |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| MUL                                       | 58       | 36     |             | 58        | 55      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 65       | 62     |             | 67        | 67      |              | 67       | 80      |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 50       | 59     | 54          | 47        | 51      | 45           | 45       | 75      | 59        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 13       | 37     | 38          | 13        | 40      | 42           | 8        |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 30       | 59     | 61          | 39        | 50      | 45           | 34       | 15      |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 59       | 55     | 45          | 50        | 48      | 23           | 49       | 56      | 50        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 51       | 56     | 55          | 50        | 47      | 43           | 50       | 52      | 58        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 69       |        |             | 62        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 63       | 53     |             | 55        | 53      | 46           | 50       | 55      |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 54       | 56     | 52          | 50        | 49      | 40           | 51       | 52      | 58        |                   |                     |

### 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  | 41  |
| 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 | 54  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 409 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10  |
| Percent Tested  | 97% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 13  |
| 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                                       | 31  |
| 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                                    | 43  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 39  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | YES |
| 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   | 40  |
| 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                                | 39  |
| 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?

Students in grades 4-8 in reading and math experienced losses in learning. 4th grade ELA and Math scores went down 14% and 36% respectively. 5th grade ELA and Math scores went down 17% and 25% respectively. 6th grade ELA and Math scores went down 18% and 29% respectively. 7th grade ELA and Math scores went down 3% and 40% respectively. 8th grade ELA and Math scores went down 1% and 8% respectively.

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

Our greatest need for improvement is in the area of mathematics. We saw a loss in learning in mathematics from all tested grade levels.

#### 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 greatest contributing factor for this need for improvement was that fact that 70% of our students remained virtual for the majority of the 20-21 school year. This challenge interfered with student learning, since students were often off camera, not paying attention, not completing work, and not responding to teacher instruction regardless of multiple attempts. The first action was taken for us, which is having all the students back in the building for face-to-face instruction. This action will allow the implementation of evidence-based strategies, such as small group instruction and increase engagement.

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

According to the data, 3rd grade ELA showed the most improvement. Achievement increased from 43% in 2018-2019 to 49% in 2020-2021.

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

Our third grade team lead and another teacher on the team were returning teachers with experience in teaching third grade content.

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

In order to accelerate learning, we need to implement new strategies that will improve student learning. Our professional development plans will focus on helping our teachers analyze data and work in small groups. By identifying the grouping of our students (low, medium, and high), we will be able to provide interventions to accelerate learning.

#### 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.

Professional development opportunities will revolve around supporting teachers (both new to the profession and veteran teachers) understand how to create and manage meaningful and engaging

small group lessons to target learning deficits and monitor student growth. As stated previously, the majority of our students had learned from home during the 2020-2021 school year. Through diagnostic testing and teacher assessment, teachers will need to analyze the data and evaluate how to target student learning needs to close the gaps created by distance learning. Professional development focused around disaggregating data, understanding the standards and using those tools to create and implement engaging small groups with cooperative learning strategies (such as from Kagan Cooperative Learning), teachers will be armed with the resources to support our students meet growth goals.

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

Our school has utilized funds that will be sustainable to hire three individuals as intervention specialists. Their role will be to support the teachers pull and facilitate small group instruction, review data, and assist the Lead Teachers in executing purposeful data chats. Their roles will extend to familiarizing with the BEST standards and helping teachers familiarize with the new language to continue an upwards trajectory for student growth and proficiency. Additionally, Mater Brighton Lakes (6-8) has been awarded the VILS grant, which will assist our students and teachers utilize the more readily available digital curriculum and resources that have been generated because of the COVID pandemic. This technology will also help our students stay connected during times when they may be sent home on quarantine.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | With data showing a loss in learning in all subject areas for all students, except third grade, it is evident that teachers need to be monitored and supported to improve student learning.  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | By implementing an observation schedule and providing teachers with timely feedback, teachers will be able to improve student learning. Teachers will be observed once per week and provided feedback to improve their instructional practices to increase student learning. With the implementation of a systematic observation measuring tool, Mater Brighton Lakes will improve their FSA scores by 5% in all grade levels and subject areas. |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Leadership personnel will monitor this area of focus to ensure teachers are observed and provided feedback to improve the instructional process.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Observation tools will be used to implement this area of focus.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Observation tools will be used to monitor teaching and provide timely feedback to improve instructional practices and strategies to improve student performance.   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Leadership team will create an observation schedule to ensure teachers will be observed and monitored once per week. Leadership team will provide timely feedback to teachers to improve instructional practice to increase student learning. Leadership team will mentor teachers and provide modeling and observation opportunities so teachers can improve their instructional practices.

**Person Responsible** Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | ELA has been identified as an area in critical need, as there was a learning loss for all grades, except 3rd grade, for the 2020-2021 school year. In 4th, 5th, and 6th grade, we saw the greatest losses with 14%, 17%, and 18% respectively. This deficit makes it more difficult to improve proficiency rates when students need to make up learning from previous years. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | With the implementation of new curriculum, progress monitoring data systems, and interventionists, Mater Brighton Lakes will increase their FSA scores for all grade levels and subject areas by 5%.   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | NWEA and iReady will be utilized as a benchmark to monitor progress in student achievement. Data chats with teachers will take place quarterly to go over the results and to target the specific areas that need improvement.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | In order to increase achievement, we will utilize Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices (Rigor, Expectations, and Engagement). Teachers will increase the rigor by implementing the depth of knowledge levels in their lessons. Lessons taught will be aligned to the standards, and teachers will increase student engagement.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | By focusing on the instructional practices that our teachers utilize to teach students, implementing small group instruction, and monitoring student data, we will determine which grade levels and subject areas need revisions and to adjust practices and methods to improve student learning.  |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teachers will be provided with professional development to learn new curriculum and how to progress monitor students with diagnostic data. Teachers will partake in data chats three times per year, after diagnostic testing to indicate different tiers of student learning. Teachers will work with interventionists to create plans of instruction to close learning gaps.

**Person Responsible** Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Math has been identified as an area in critical need, as there was a learning loss for all grades for the 2020-2021 school year. In 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th grade, we saw the greatest losses with 36%, 25%, 29%, and 40% respectively. This deficit makes it more difficult to improve proficiency rates when students need to make up learning from previous years. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | With the implementation of new curriculum, progress monitoring data systems, and interventionists, Mater Brighton Lakes will increase their FSA scores for all grade levels and subject areas by 5%.   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | NWEA and iReady will be utilized as a benchmark to monitor progress in student achievement. Data chats with teachers will take place quarterly to go over the results and to target the specific areas that need improvement.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | In order to increase achievement, we will utilize Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices (Rigor, Expectations, and Engagement). Teachers will increase the rigor by implementing the depth of knowledge levels in their lessons. Lessons taught will be aligned to the standards, and teachers will increase student engagement.                                |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | By focusing on the instructional practices that our teachers utilize to teach students, implementing small group instruction, and monitoring student data, we will determine which grade levels and subject areas need revisions and to adjust practices and methods to improve student learning.  |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teachers will be provided with professional development to learn new curriculum and how to progress monitor students with diagnostic data. Teachers will partake in data chats three times per year, after diagnostic testing to indicate different tiers of student learning. Teachers will work with interventionists to create plans of instruction to close learning gaps.

**Person Responsible** Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)



**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Since we are a school that focuses on student achievement and growth, we have identified science as one of our lowest percentage on student achievement. Science is fundamental for students to understand their world around them and for them to learn critical thinking. It is evident, that science achievement is an area of need that needs to be addressed at our school.

**Measurable Outcome:** In 2020-2021, science achievement was 29%. In 2021-2022, science achievement will increase by 5% to 34%.

**Monitoring:** NWEA will be utilized as a benchmark to monitor progress in student achievement. Data chats with teachers will take place quarterly to go over the results and to target the specific areas that need improvement.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** In order to increase achievement, we will utilize Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices (Rigor, Expectations, and Engagement). Teachers will increase the rigor by implementing the depth of knowledge levels in their lessons. Lessons taught will be aligned to the standards, and teachers will increase student engagement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Due to the pandemic, most of our student remained virtual for the majority of last year limiting hands-on experiences in science. This resulted in the decrease of 21% in science achievement. With that challenge, teachers were limited in how deep they could teach a science concept and how to engage the students. Additionally, many of the science teachers are new and in need to focus on understanding rigor, expectations, and how to engage students effectively. Akey states, "students learn more and retain more information when they actively participate in the learning process and when they can relate to what is being taught" (Akey, 2006).

**Action Steps to Implement**

Staff will be trained in the depth of knowledge levels and how to apply them to their standards.

**Person Responsible** Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)

Staff will be trained in different strategies to increase student engagement

**Person Responsible** Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)

Mentoring and coaching will take place to provide support to the teachers.

**Person Responsible** Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)

Leadership team will keep teachers accountable through classroom observations and immediate feedback and support to improve student achievement.

**Person Responsible** Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)

Staff will use progress monitoring data, classroom observations and scoring rubrics to identify individual student needs.

**Person Responsible** Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)

**#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>  | Students within ESSA subgroups continue to perform lower than other students, making this a critical need for Mater Brighton Lakes.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>   | By increasing the number of personnel that work with our subgroup populations of students to provide more support, direct instruction, and small group practices, Mater Brighton Lakes will increase their FSA scores for all grade levels and subject areas by 5%.   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>   | After each diagnostic testing, data will be evaluated by the leadership team and shared with teachers and support personnel to determine if the strategies in place are effective. Changes to implementation practices will be evaluated and determined if changes are necessary to improve student outcomes.                         |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>  | [no one identified]   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>  | In order to increase achievement, we will utilize Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices (Rigor, Expectations, and Engagement). Teachers will increase the rigor by implementing the depth of knowledge levels in their lessons. Lessons taught will be aligned to the standards, and teachers will increase student engagement. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>  | By focusing on the instructional practices that our teachers utilize to teach students, implementing small group instruction, and monitoring student data, we will determine which grade levels and subject areas need revisions and to adjust practices and methods to improve student learning.                                     |
| <b>Action Steps to Implement</b>   |   |
| Teachers will be provided with professional development to learn new curriculum and how to progress monitor students with diagnostic data. Teachers will partake in data chats three times per year, after diagnostic testing to indicate different tiers of student learning. Teachers will work with interventionists, the ESE and ELL department to create plans of instruction to close learning gaps. |   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>  | Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)   |

**#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Social Emotional Learning is at the forefront of our school in order to help students function in society, especially after being isolated due to the pandemic. For that reason, it is important that students develop a sense of belonging when they come to school, and social emotional lessons and implementation play a key role in developing the sense of community.

**Measurable Outcome:** The Measurable Results Assessment (MRA) conducted by Franklin Covey, indicated that 47% of our students feels a sense of belonging. In the 2021-2022 school year, students will be provided opportunities which will increase their sense of belonging by 10%.

**Monitoring:** During SEL lessons and morning meetings, teachers will check in weekly with their students to assess their social-emotional well-being. A survey will also be given at the end of the year to assess if there was increase in this area.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Students will be provided leadership opportunities within our school, which will help students get invested and get involved. This involvement will help create a sense of community and develop their sense of belonging. Morning meetings will also be scheduled for teachers and students to discuss important matters.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) approach is one that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. They use teaching techniques that build on student's current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

**Action Steps to Implement**

SEL lessons will be provided to the teachers by our school counselor.

**Person Responsible** Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)

SEL lessons will be given minimum once a week in a formal lesson format.

**Person Responsible** Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)

Morning meetings will also be integrated on a weekly basis to allow informal discussion of SEL topics.

**Person Responsible** Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)

The school counselor will be available to intervene and assist any students who need social-emotional support.

**Person Responsible** Lizaira Llerena (lllerena@materpalms.com)

**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.

**School-wide data is reviewed on a quarterly basis to determine which areas are in need of improvement and what strategies will work best to see improvement. By creating an inclusive school culture and environment, all stakeholders contribute to our improvement discussions and determine what is necessary for our school to see progress.**

#### **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.**

Mater Brighton Lakes supports incoming cohorts through the use of a lottery system in which all applicants shall have an equal chance of being admitted through a random selection process conducted in conformity with Florida's Charter School Legislation. The school shall enroll any eligible student who submits a timely application.

Additionally, Mater Brighton Lakes Academy is a Leader in Me school, which is based on the Seven Habits of Highly Effective People by Stephen Covey. In teaching the seven habits, we are creating a culture where every one is a leader from staff members to students to parents. These habits teach life skills that will help them become successful citizens outside of the school building. Furthermore, the Leader in Me framework assists individuals in creating measurable goals in leadership, academics, and culture and actions steps to obtain those goals.

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

Mater Brighton Lakes Academy involves all stakeholders in promoting a positive culture and environment. The leadership team meets on a weekly basis to discuss any areas in need of improvement in all curricular areas in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize student outcomes.

Teachers meet and collaborate weekly to discuss what is working and what needs improvement at our school. Weekly staff meetings are held to give teachers a voice to hear their input to improve school processes. Monthly meetings are held with parents to collaborate on how the school can improve. Additionally, training is provided to staff and parents on Leader in Me, which contributes to our 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: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback            |   |                 |     |         | \$0.00 |
| 2      | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA                      |   |                 |     |         | \$0.00 |
|        | Function | Object   | Budget Focus  | Funding Source  | FTE | 2021-22 |        |
|        | 5100     | 520-Textbooks  | 0163 - Mater Brighton Lakes   | Title, I Part A |     | \$0.00  |        |
|        |          |  | Notes: Curriculum Associates-iReady, MAFS, LAFS, Performance Coach USA Test Prep Nearpod Edmentum |                 |     |         |        |
| 3      | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math                     |   |                 |     |         | \$0.00 |
|        | Function | Object   | Budget Focus  | Funding Source  | FTE | 2021-22 |        |
|        | 5100     | 520-Textbooks  | 0163 - Mater Brighton Lakes   | Title, I Part A |     | \$0.00  |        |
|        |          |  | Notes: Curriculum Associates-iReady, MAFS, Performance Coach USA Test Prep Nearpod Edmentum       |                 |     |         |        |
| 4      | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science                  |   |                 |     |         | \$0.00 |
|        | Function | Object   | Budget Focus  | Funding Source  | FTE | 2021-22 |        |
|        | 5100     | 520-Textbooks  | 0163 - Mater Brighton Lakes   | Title, I Part A |     | \$0.00  |        |
|        |          |  | Notes: USA Test Prep Nearpod Edmentum   |                 |     |         |        |
| 5      | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups   |   |                 |     |         | \$0.00 |
| 6      | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning |   |                 |     |         | \$0.00 |
| Total: |          |  |   |                 |     | \$0.00  |        |