

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Mater Academy



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>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>22</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>22</b> |

# Mater Academy

7700 NW 98TH ST, Hialeah Gardens, FL 33016

www.mater elementary.com

## Demographics

Principal: Chantel Morales V

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-5  |
| <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)  | 92%  |
| <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>Hispanic Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (66%)<br>2017-18: A (69%)<br>2016-17: B (54%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</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, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade 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>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>22</b> |

# Mater Academy

7700 NW 98TH ST, Hialeah Gardens, FL 33016

www.mater elementary.com

## School Demographics

|   |                               |   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | <b>2020-21 Title I School</b> | <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School<br>KG-5                               | Yes                           | 88%   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)          | <b>Charter School</b>         | <b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                                  | Yes                           | 100%  |

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade 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.**

Our mission is to provide a loving, caring, and supportive educational environment that furthers a philosophy of respect and high expectations for all students, parents, faculty, and staff.

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

The vision of Mater Academy is to create a safe, nurturing and stimulating environment.

### 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   |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| Morales, Chantel  | Principal           | Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing Rtl, conducts assessment of Rtl skills of schools staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support Rtl implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based Rtl plans and activities.   |
| Rafael, Christina | Assistant Principal | Provides guidance on K - 2nd grade reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plans.  |
| Prado, Jeanette   | Assistant Principal | Provides guidance on 3rd - 5th grade reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plans.  |
| Suarez, Deneb     | Instructional Coach | Develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/programs; identify and analyze existing curriculum on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidenced- based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk,” assist in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring. |
| Miranda, Maite    | Instructional Coach | Develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/programs; identify and analyze existing curriculum on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidenced- based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk,” assist in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring. |
| Martinez, Janette | Other               | Coordinates the school’s program for ESL students; Collaborates with district staff and outside personnel to provide educational opportunities for ESL and Migrant student; Implements procedures and coordinates the process to identify ELL students at all grade levels school-wide, including review of student data and testing of students. Consults with parents, administrators, counselors, teachers, and other relevant individuals regarding ESL students; In addition,  |

| Name           | Position Title   | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|----------------|------------------|---|
|                |                  | the ESL Program Coordinator plans and conducts parent meetings, including parent advisory committee meetings.   |
| Mendez, Lauren | School Counselor | Provide quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, the school guidance counselor continues to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral and social success. Counselors are responsible to comply and implement the School's Mental Health Plan. |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Thursday 7/1/2021, Chantel Morales V

**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.*

0

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

74

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

1,317

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

3

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

11

**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                              | 228         | 230 | 183 | 225 | 232 | 219 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1317  |
| 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                                    | 1           | 6   | 1   | 5   | 6   | 4   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 22  | 34  | 26  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 82    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 33  | 50  | 62  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 145   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1           | 6   | 1   | 22  | 34  | 26  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 90    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1           | 6 | 1 | 22 | 34 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 90    |

**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           | 6 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 9/1/2021

**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               | 219         | 192 | 224 | 234 | 220 | 216 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1305  |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 1           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 2   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| One or more suspensions                   | 1           | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 3   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 1           | 2   | 0   | 3   | 2   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| 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   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 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           | 4 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 48 |

**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           | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 8  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 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               | 219         | 192 | 224 | 234 | 220 | 216 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 1305 |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 1           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 2   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 3    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 1           | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 3   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 5    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 1           | 2   | 0   | 3   | 2   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 8    |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 0    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 0    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 0    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 4 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 48 |

**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           | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 8  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 0  |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data 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             |        |          |       | 75%    | 62%      | 57%   | 73%    | 62%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 70%    | 62%      | 58%   | 71%    | 62%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 60%    | 58%      | 53%   | 62%    | 59%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 76%    | 69%      | 63%   | 75%    | 69%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 67%    | 66%      | 62%   | 70%    | 64%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 48%    | 55%      | 51%   | 59%    | 55%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 68%    | 55%      | 53%   | 71%    | 58%      | 55%   |

**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 | 73%    | 60%      | 13%                        | 58%   | 15%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 78%    | 64%      | 14%                        | 58%   | 20%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -73%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 73%    | 60%      | 13%                        | 56%   | 17%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -78%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 76%    | 67%      | 9%                         | 62%   | 14%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 79%    | 69%      | 10%                        | 64%   | 15%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -76%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 74%    | 65%      | 9%                         | 60%   | 14%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -79%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 68%    | 53%      | 15%                        | 53%   | 15%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

To monitor students' progress, The School will use the Florida State Assessment.

| Grade 1               |   |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students  |      |        |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students  |      |        |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners |      |        |        |
| Grade 2               |   |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students  |      |        |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students  |      |        |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners |      |        |        |

| Grade 3               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               |      |        | 69.6   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 70.7   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 41.2   |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 30     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               |      |        | 63.9   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 59.1   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 41.7   |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 42.5   |

| Grade 4               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               |      |        | 52.1   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 51.3   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 30.8   |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 37     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               |      |        | 51     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 53.8   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 15.4   |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 31.1   |

| Grade 5               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               |      |        | 59.6   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 60.4   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 30.8   |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 25.9   |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               |      |        | 42.6   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 63.6   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 21.4   |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 46.3   |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science               | All Students               |      |        | 38     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        | 37.9   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        | 25     |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        | 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                                       | 33       | 50     | 42          | 27        | 31      | 30           | 25       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 61       | 51     | 52          | 51        | 33      | 35           | 35       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 61       | 52     | 43          | 54        | 24      | 28           | 39       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 61       | 51     | 40          | 52        | 24      | 28           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 43       | 65     | 70          | 60        | 55      | 40           | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 73       | 69     | 62          | 75        | 67      | 55           | 68       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 74       | 69     | 60          | 77        | 67      | 48           | 68       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 75       | 69     | 61          | 76        | 67      | 49           | 66       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       | 48       | 59     | 50          | 35        | 59      | 45           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 67       | 67     | 58          | 72        | 76      | 62           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 74       | 71     | 63          | 75        | 70      | 60           | 70       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 73       | 72     | 63          | 75        | 70      | 59           | 71       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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  | 45  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 58  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 358 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |
| Percent Tested  | 98% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 35  |
| 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                                       | 47  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        |     |
| Native American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students  |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%         |     |
| Asian Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students  |     |

| Asian Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| 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                                    |     |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 45  |
| 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   |     |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 44  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

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



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

According to The School's progress monitoring, the school has demonstrated an overall growth in Reading proficiency. In 2019-2020, the percentage of students on mid or above grade level grew from 16% on the Fall Assessment to 56% on the Spring Assessment. In 2020-2021, the percentage of students on mid or above grade level grew from 26% on the Fall Assessment to 50% on the Spring Assessment.

Another trend that showed an increase in performance is the Math proficiency level on The School's progress monitoring. In 2019-2020, the percentage of students on mid or above grade level grew from 6% on the Fall Assessment to 48% on the Spring Assessment. In 2020-2021, the percentage of students on mid or above grade level grew from 15% on the Fall Assessment to 43% on the Spring Assessment.

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

The learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile of SWD on the Spring 2019 FSA Math Assessment showed the greatest decline in performance, from 60% in 2018 to 48% in 2019.

**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 fidelity of the intervention program was compromised by several factors, including, lack of instructional space to deliver interventions, strength of intervention curriculum and poor training on the use of the provided curriculum.

The School will increase collaboration services for SWD and implement more intense intervention with increased fidelity for this group of students. Our school's intervention program will target each student's individual needs and increase classroom interventions, tutoring and provide additional resources.

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

The achievement level of SWD on the Spring 2019 FSA Math Assessment showed the greatest improvement in performance, from 35% in 2018 to 60% in 2019.

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

The School increased collaboration services for SWD and implemented intervention with increased fidelity for this group of students.

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

Some strategies that will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning are using data to drive differentiated instruction and a more individualized intervention plan. Teachers will use their progress monitoring and previous state assessment data to tailor instruction to meet individual needs. Additionally, teachers will incorporate flexible grouping to respond to variance among learners in the classroom.

The School's intervention program will utilize the i-Ready Extra Lessons and i-Ready Toolbox Lessons to provide

activities in which the student engages in order to make sense of or master the content. This program is designed to identify struggling students early on and closely monitor their progress using data to guide instruction.

During and outside of a regular school day/year, students will continue to have access to i-Ready.

The program will automatically assign on-grade level lessons in Reading and Math to prepare students for the upcoming grade levels.

**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.**

The district works collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide professional development opportunities for teachers to effectively implement and monitor academic and behavioral interventions. Five virtual coaching days were also provided to teachers to understand the newly adopted Reading intervention program and learn new strategies for collecting and analyzing data to continuously monitor student progress. In addition, throughout the year several coaching days will be provided to teachers and school leadership teams to monitor student learning and address challenges that may arise throughout the school year

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

Students will receive modified support using resources and skills to help them strengthen areas of weakness exhibited. Additionally, students will receive after school tutoring for Reading and Math. Students will be placed in groups depending on their academic needs in both Reading and Math. The tutoring program will be taking place from October- April for grades 3-5. Teachers will also incorporate online resources to target the learning loss. Teachers will use Wonder Works during differentiated instruction to target the specific skills based on their individual needs. The School has also purchased a new program this year, IXL. IXL will be used to build vocabulary and master essential skills at their own pace in Reading and Math. Teachers will closely monitor student data to track student progress in all subject areas. Students will learn how to track data using i-Ready, quarterly assessments, and grades throughout the school year. The School will be incorporating a Leadership Notebook for each student to help keep track and analyze their data.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Other specifically relating to Attendance**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Decreasing the number of students who are chronically absent. After analyzing our 2020-2021 school wide data, we noticed a high percentage of students who were chronically absent.

**Measurable Outcome:** Decrease the percentage of chronically absent students by at least 3 percentage points.

**Monitoring:** The school's Guidance Counselor will monitor student attendance bi-weekly.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Lauren Mendez (lmendez@mater elementary.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Communicate attendance expectations to parents, create Attendance/Truancy team, and create an Early Intervention Program.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students who attend school regularly have been shown to achieve at higher levels than students who do not have regular attendance.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide Parent/Student Handbook to parents, which explains the attendance expectations.
2. Discuss attendance expectations at Open House events.
3. Leadership team will identify students who are chronically absent.
4. Guidance Counselor will monitor attendance daily.
5. Guidance Counselor will maintain communication with parents or guardians of chronically absent students.

**Person Responsible** Lauren Mendez (lmendez@mater elementary.com)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** After an analysis of the 2019 school wide data, a decrease in the achievement of the lowest 25th percentile on the FSA ELA assessment.

**Measurable Outcome:** The School plans to increase the achievement of the lowest 25th percentile in Math from 60% to 70%.

**Monitoring:** School leadership team will identify students in grades 3-5 who scored a level 1 or 2 on the 2019 FSA ELA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Deneb Suarez (dsuarez@mater elementary.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The evidence based strategy that will be implemented is increased interventions in the area of ELA. Students in grades 3-5 who scored a level 1 or level 2 on the 2019 ELA FSA, or who were retained will be participating in daily ELA interventions.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Research indicates that that students struggling with ELA may benefit from early interventions aimed at improving their ELA ability and ultimately preventing subsequent failure.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. School leadership team will identify students in grades 3-5 who scored a level 1 or 2 on the 2019 FSA ELA.

**Person Responsible** Deneb Suarez (dsuarez@mater elementary.com)

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | After an analysis of the 2019 school wide data, a decrease in points in the achievement of the lowest 25th percentile on the FSA Mathematics assessment.  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | The School plans to increase the achievement of the lowest 25th percentile in Math from 60% to 70%.   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | School leadership team will identify students in grades 3-5 who scored a level 1 or 2 on the 2019 FSA Math.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Maite Miranda (mmiranda@mater elementary.com)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | The evidence based strategy that will be implemented is increased interventions in the area of Math. Students in grades 3-5 who scored a level 1 or level 2 on the 2019 Math FSA, or who were retained will be participating in Math interventions, at a minimum of 3 times a week. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Research indicates that that students struggling with Math may benefit from early interventions aimed at improving their Math ability and ultimately preventing subsequent failure.   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. School leadership team will identify students in grades 3-5 who scored a level 1 or 2 on the 2019 FSA Math.

**Person Responsible** Maite Miranda (mmiranda@mater elementary.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.

**The School reported 0.1 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all elementary schools statewide, it falls into the very low category. Mater Academy is ranked #114 out of 1,396 elementary schools statewide.**

**The School's culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior and discipline data by guiding students in setting up behavior goals, help them to understand their own behavior and its effect on others, and to ultimately equip them to recognize and practice the behaviors necessary for success in school.**

### Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

#### Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The School will build a positive school culture as a place where efforts are translated into positive experiences for both staff and students. By building a more positive culture and environment, students, families, and educators work together to develop and live a shared school vision. The School teaches students how to become life-long leaders using the Leader in Me curriculum. This curriculum teaches 21st century leadership and life skills to students and creates a culture of student empowerment based on the idea that every child can be a leader.

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

The school utilizes a variety of partnerships with local and community programs, such as MDCPS Parent Academy to support the school and student achievement. The Parent Academy provides many professional developments for parents to support student achievement. Professional developments such as "Less Stress About the Test" and "Family Building Better Readers" are provided in order for parents to become aware of the resources that are available. Additionally, parents are welcome to participate in the Mater Academy Parent Association (MAPA). MAPA allows parents and community to volunteer in school events and encourage parental support and involvement. Our school counselors are in constant communication with parents/guardians and teachers, in regards to school-wide student services activities, e.g. parent education groups, career awareness, and orientation and articulation activities.

### Part V: Budget

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

|   |          |   |                                  |                |     |             |
|---|----------|---|----------------------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|
| 1 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Other: Attendance           |                                  |                |     | \$0.00      |
| 2 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA |                                  |                |     | \$32,225.00 |
|   | Function | Object                                      | Budget Focus                     | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22     |
|   | 1382     | 690-Computer Software                       | 0100 - Mater Academy             | General Fund   |     | \$3,249.50  |
|   |          |   | Notes: Coach Digital: \$3,249.50 |                |     |             |

|          |               |   |   |                |               |                    |
|----------|---------------|---|---|----------------|---------------|--------------------|
|          | 1382          | 690-Computer Software                               | 0100 - Mater Academy                    | General Fund   |               | \$14,715.00        |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: i-Ready: \$14,715.00</i>      |                |               |                    |
|          | 1382          | 690-Computer Software                               | 0100 - Mater Academy                    | Other Federal  |               | \$14,260.50        |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: IXL: \$14,260.50</i>          |                |               |                    |
| <b>3</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b> |   |                |               | <b>\$32,224.50</b> |
|          | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus                            | Funding Source | FTE           | 2021-22            |
|          | 1382          | 690-Computer Software                               | 0100 - Mater Academy                    | General Fund   |               | \$3,249.00         |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: Coach Digital: \$3,249.00</i> |                |               |                    |
|          | 1382          | 690-Computer Software                               | 0100 - Mater Academy                    | General Fund   |               | \$14,715.00        |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: i-Ready: \$14,714</i>         |                |               |                    |
|          | 1382          | 690-Computer Software                               | 0100 - Mater Academy                    | General Fund   |               | \$14,260.50        |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: IXL: \$14,260.50</i>          |                |               |                    |
|          |               |   |   |                | <b>Total:</b> | <b>\$64,449.50</b> |