

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Mater Grove Academy



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	22
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	25

Mater Grove Academy

2805 SW 32ND AVE, Miami, FL 33133

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Sheila Gonzalez

Start Date for this Principal: 9/13/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	19%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	22
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Mater Grove Academy

2805 SW 32ND AVE, Miami, FL 33133

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	67%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	96%

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, where the whole child is developed and a philosophy of respect and high expectations is instilled for all students, parents, teachers, and staff.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Mater we will strive to create a thirst for knowledge in all disciplines of the curriculum and enrich every student with a sense of purpose, a belief in their own efficacy, and a commitment to the common good.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Caleo, Sheila	Principal	Sheila Caleo's role as principal is to provide the school with a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensuring that the school-based team is implementing a multi-tiered system of support, and conducting assessments on the effectiveness of the implementation through observation, documentation, and analysis of data. Additionally, she provides the staff with opportunities for professional development and communicates with all stakeholders regarding the school's goals and objectives, and the plans put in place to achieve those desirable outcomes.
Toledo, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	Elizabeth Toledo provides the data for the principal and instructional coaches in order to facilitate data chats with the teachers. The assistant principal also seeks to find the instructional programs and classroom materials that will best address the needs of learners in an effort to help close learning gaps.
Paz, Raquel	Instructional Coach	The instructional coaches support the school goals by meeting with teachers to discuss their student data and identify trends that should be addressed. They provide instructional support to the teachers through collaborative lesson planning, modeling, and guiding the selection process for small group instruction. Instructional coaches meet often with teachers to provide feedback on the progress being made by their respective students.
Diaz, Samantha	Instructional Coach	The instructional coaches support the school goals by meeting with teachers to discuss their student data and identify trends that should be addressed. They provide instructional support to the teachers through collaborative lesson planning, modeling, and guiding the selection process for small group instruction. Instructional coaches meet often with teachers to provide feedback on the progress being made by their respective students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/13/2021, Sheila Gonzalez

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

73

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,198

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

9

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

15

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	145	140	139	143	133	149	127	116	106	0	0	0	0	1198
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	3	9	2	5	11	2	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	2	20	12	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	2	23	4	35	51	46	51	47	0	0	0	0	259
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	16	30	3	41	63	66	52	40	0	0	0	0	311
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	23	4	35	51	46	51	47	0	0	0	0	259

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	2	14	4	31	45	40	37	29	0	0	0	0	202

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	1	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/30/2021

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	144	129	141	147	139	130	132	113	127	0	0	0	0	1202
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	0	7	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	2	4	3	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	3	14	3	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	7	0	3	37	30	16	24	0	0	0	0	117
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	1	11	0	3	25	18	24	27	0	0	0	0	109

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	2	5	1	3	15	10	20	10	0	0	0	66

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	5	0	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times		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	144	129	141	147	139	130	132	113	127	0	0	0	0	1202
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	0	7	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	2	4	3	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	3	14	3	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	7	0	3	37	30	16	24	0	0	0	0	117
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	1	11	0	3	25	18	24	27	0	0	0	0	109

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	2	5	1	3	15	10	20	10	0	0	0	0	66

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	5	0	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	11
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				71%	63%	61%	67%	62%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	61%	59%	67%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	57%	54%	72%	57%	52%
Math Achievement				70%	67%	62%	72%	65%	61%
Math Learning Gains				60%	63%	59%	63%	61%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	56%	52%	47%	55%	52%
Science Achievement				55%	56%	56%	56%	57%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				81%	80%	78%	87%	79%	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	69%	60%	9%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	70%	64%	6%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%	60%	1%	56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
06	2021					
	2019	82%	58%	24%	54%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	68%	56%	12%	52%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
08	2021					
	2019	66%	60%	6%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	80%	67%	13%	62%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	69%	-3%	64%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	65%	-12%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
06	2021					
	2019	78%	58%	20%	55%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
07	2021					
	2019	73%	53%	20%	54%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
08	2021					
	2019	29%	40%	-11%	46%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	44%	53%	-9%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	71%	43%	28%	48%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	79%	73%	6%	71%	8%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	83%	63%	20%	61%	22%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We used proficiency levels from the SAT-10 for Grades 1 and 2. For Grades 3-8 we used FSA, EOC, and NGSSS scores from the 2020-2021 school year.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			64
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			57
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			60
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			43
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			70.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			68.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			64.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			53.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			61.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			46.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			33.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			52.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			50
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			55
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			59.6
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			62.4
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			72.1
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			43
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			50.8
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	33	59	69	26	31	20	21				
ELL	51	49	52	47	35	21	31	48	29		
BLK	26	35		13	18						
HSP	64	53	48	55	33	24	43	62	48		
WHT	87	75		70	38		64				
FRL	55	49	48	47	32	26	37	58	42		
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	42	57	45	45	61	42					
ELL	61	64	54	66	57	42	41	77	50		
BLK	39	33		28	33						
HSP	72	65	49	72	61	49	54	81	74		

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
WHT	83	59		75	65						
FRL	66	61	50	62	49	39	44	65	67		
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	33	69	80	48	63	40					
ELL	52	65	74	62	52	45	47				
BLK	36	69		36	56						
HSP	69	66	69	74	63	45	58	87	59		
WHT	69			75							
FRL	60	69	73	64	58	46	45	81	65		

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	486
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	23
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
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?

We have observed lower overall achievement levels in Math. We have also noticed that in the reporting category in Reading of Key Ideas and Details students are showing lower rates of levels of proficiency. Another area of concern would be our ESSA subgroup data for our Black/African American students.

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

The greatest need for improvement would be in the core content area of Mathematics. Overall, the scores are lower in math than in reading.

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

The contributing factors were that students were taking their summative and formative assessments virtually through Google Classroom. Some of the students were taking assessments at home without supervision. RLI instruction can be difficult for certain students to learn. The new actions we would need to be take to address these needs would be to ensure students are completing their weekly i-Ready minutes and lessons weekly. Teachers will continue progress monitoring through i-Ready and IXL. Administration will also monitor assessments given through performance matters. Allocating in class time for students to complete instructional programs and for Differentiated Instruction in order to close learning gaps.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement was ELA Achievement. Overall we showed an increase

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

The actions taken during the 2019-2020 school year were the interventions and teaching strategies implemented in the classroom to engage students in learning. Mandatory after school and Saturday tutoring occurred to help support the students that were in the lowest 25th percentile. Lead Teacher and Curriculum Specialist aided teachers with lesson plans tailored to target those deficiencies.

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

We have purchased the new Wonder series for Reading which is aligned to new curriculum (B.E.S.T Standards). We have also implemented a new intervention program for Reading called Lexia. Students will be given a placement test and will be given goals based on their academic needs. It is proven than support in Reading benefits all content areas equally.

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

Teachers will have the opportunity to participate in the B.E.S.T Standards training for Reading and Math. This will help teachers better understand the new curriculum our state has adopted. Our Mater Network will also provide a variety of professional developments for teachers that will help foster the needs of our students.

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

Monthly data chats by grade level will be held to analyze if there has been improvements in reading and math. Content area teachers across all grade levels will meet in a PLC to discuss data and strategies to close learning gaps. Progress monitoring through i-Ready and Performance Matters assessments will continue to occur to ensure students are showing growth.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During data analysis, we have noticed that school wide there was a notable decrease in math proficiency across all grade levels. In 2019 we had 69.8% of these students score a 3 or above in Math, and in 2021 it decreased to 53.8%.
Measurable Outcome:	Our outcome is to have students in our lowest percentile to show growth in Math achievement from 53.8 % to 65%.
Monitoring:	To get the desired outcome we will monitor lesson plans to ensure differentiated instruction is occurring to target the needs of all students. We will also conduct classroom walkthroughs and formal observations. We will also monitor assessments through performance matters.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Toledo (toledo@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy that will be implemented to effectively increase math proficiency and learning gains will be to include IXL as an additional support for grades 6-8. We will continue to monitor and assign lessons through i-Ready for grades K-8.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research indicates that students struggling with math may benefit from early intervention. Students will be provided with additional lessons in IXL and i-Ready to target the needs of our students.

Action Steps to Implement

Data will be analyzed with all grade levels to identify our level 1 and 2 students to ensure we are targeting these students through differentiated instruction and remediation. The leadership team will monitor performance matters assessments. The leadership team will also schedule growth monitoring through i-Ready every 21 instructional days to identify progress students have made.

Person Responsible	Samantha Diaz (sdiaz@matergroveacademy.com)
---------------------------	---

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: After reviewing Data from the 2019 school year and the 2020 school year, we have noticed that our Black/African-American Subgroup showed a decrease in proficiency in ELA. In 2019 we had 38.9% of these students score a 3 or above in ELA, and in 2021 it decreased to 26.1%.

Measurable Outcome: In order to increase proficiency for our Black/African American subgroup, we will be providing students with an intensive reading courses as applicable / push in support/ afterschool tutoring . We will also have these students complete lessons using Lexia Learning. Our goal is to increase to 50%.

Monitoring: We will monitor Lexia weekly by setting goals with the students. Data chats will occur monthly with each grade level to ensure students are showing growth. We will also monitor formative and summative assessments through Performance Matters.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Elizabeth Toledo (toledo@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy being implemented to support this subgroup is to have our ESE Team work with these students in a small group setting to help close learning gaps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research indicates that students struggling with ELA or Math may benefit from early intervention.

Action Steps to Implement

Data from i-Ready and IXL will be analyzed periodically to ensure this subgroup shows growth in Reading and Math. We will monitor formative and summative assessments through Performance Matters.

Person Responsible Sheila Caleo (920148@dadeschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our 2019 and 2020 school wide data, our SWD showed a decrease of proficiency. In 2019 school year 48.1% of the students passed the ELA assessment. In 2021 school year, 31.3% of the students passed the ELA Assessment. As for Math, we also saw a decline from 44% to 25.6%.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to be at or above the federal index of 45%.
Monitoring:	We will monitor their growth through i-Ready Reading and Math Lessons. We will complete growth monitoring check points to ensure students are showing proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Samantha Diaz (sdiaz@matergroveacademy.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students with disabilities will be provided with targeted small group instruction provided by our ESE support team. They will help assist in closing learning gaps and increasing proficiency levels in Reading and Math.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data has proven that implementing small group instruction helps target the needs of all SWD and helps increase proficiency levels.

Action Steps to Implement

ESE coordinator created a schedule for the ESE support team to visit classrooms that include SWD and they will provide small group instruction in Reading and Math. ESE Coordinator will monitor the fidelity of this small group instruction by completing daily walkthroughs as well as closely monitoring data through formative and summative assessments.

Person Responsible Sheila Caleo (920148@dadeschools.net)

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.

We ranked #28 out of 313 combination schools statewide. In the county of MDCPS we ranked # 8 out of 66 schools. We are rated as a "very low" school. We will monitor tobacco usage by installing Halo detectors in bathrooms to monitor student use. Additionally, we are implementing a social emotional learning program called Leader in Me. This program teaches students healthy habits and is based off the "7 Habits of Highly Effective People". We believe this program will help impact students directly in a positive manner therefore reducing behavior concerns.

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 implements a wide variety of communication methods in order to inform parents about upcoming events. Some of these methods include: monthly school calendar (posted on school website and emailed by homeroom teacher), PALS (Parents as Liaisons) newsletters, Constant Contact emails, Shutterfly class webpages, classroom websites, Parent Academy workshops and Remind 101. Principal and Assistant Principal will monitor implementation and review sign in sheets to determine the number of parents attending school or community events for effectiveness. Teachers also use Class DOJO/ Class Tag or other messaging systems as a means of communication on a daily basis to the parents in regards to academic and behavioral progress and/or concerns.

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

In order to promote a positive culture and environment in our school, we have implemented Leader in Me Lighthouse team meetings. These meetings include a variety of stakeholders that discuss was to build a character education program for our students. Our parent association known as PALS, meets monthly to discuss events or other activities that can be implemented to create a positive culture in our school. Grade level meetings are also held monthly to discuss the needs of each grade level and what needs to be implemented to ensure students have a positive learning environment.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math					\$29,430.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22	
		399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	5045 - Mater Grove Academy	Other Federal		\$29,430.00	
			Notes: i-Ready				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American					\$0.00

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	5045 - Mater Grove Academy	Other Federal		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Lexia Learning</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$11,900.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	5045 - Mater Grove Academy	Other Federal		\$11,900.00
			<i>Notes: Lexia Learning K-8</i>			
Total:						\$41,330.00