

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Mater Academy Lakes Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Mater Academy Lakes Middle School

17300 NW 87TH AVE, Hialeah, FL 33015

www.materlakes.org

Demographics

Principal: Marjorie Enriquez

Start Date for this Principal: 8/18/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
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 Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (66%)
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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Mater Academy Lakes Middle School

17300 NW 87TH AVE, Hialeah, FL 33015

www.materlakes.org

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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	78%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	98%

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.

Mater Lakes Academy Middle School, with immeasurable expectations for success in the classroom, in the community, and for the future, partners with teachers, administrators and staff, to create a challenging curriculum, moral values, loyalty and teamwork for a community of learners who are the successful leaders of tomorrow and epitomize the characteristics of truth, honor, and change.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Mater Lakes Academy will be a campus where students learn from teachers who are passionate about their subjects and consider it a privilege to pass knowledge to the minds of our students.

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
Aleman, Zahilys		
Enriquez, Marjorie		
Martinez, Alice		
Gonzalez, Adriana		
Rovirosa, Rene		
Rodriguez, Barbara		
Paez, Jennifer		
Mansfield, Joanna		
Kemper, Elizabeth	Teacher Science	
Burgos, Steven		Assistant Administrator

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/18/2021, Marjorie Enriquez

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

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

895

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	297	272	326	0	0	0	0	895	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	8	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	9	0	0	0	0	21	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	9	10	0	0	0	0	33	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	20	16	0	0	0	0	51	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	34	28	0	0	0	0	85	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	25	22	0	0	0	0	70	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	91	119	0	0	0	0	361	

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	27	28	30	50	0	0	0	135	

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	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 9/19/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	272	312	346	0	0	0	0	930	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	9	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	19	0	0	0	0	39	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	21	19	0	0	0	0	51	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	12	21	0	0	0	0	51	

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	23	25	44	0	0	0	0	92	

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	2	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	272	312	346	0	0	0	0	930	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	9	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	19	0	0	0	0	39	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	21	19	0	0	0	0	51	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	12	21	0	0	0	0	51	

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	23	25	44	0	0	0	0	92	

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	2	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				73%	58%	54%	72%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				66%	58%	54%	63%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	52%	47%	53%	52%	47%
Math Achievement				79%	58%	58%	75%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				68%	56%	57%	54%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	54%	51%	49%	55%	51%
Science Achievement				58%	52%	51%	65%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				81%	74%	72%	83%	73%	72%

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
06	2021					
	2019	73%	58%	15%	54%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	69%	56%	13%	52%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
08	2021					
	2019	73%	60%	13%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	79%	58%	21%	55%	24%
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	71%	53%	18%	54%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
08	2021					
	2019	72%	40%	32%	46%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	42%	43%	-1%	48%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	90%	68%	22%	67%	23%
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	93%	63%	30%	61%	32%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	96%	54%	42%	57%	39%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

IReady Data

Grade 6				
	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 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 8				
	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			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

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	28	22	9	28	29	29	18	40			
ELL	53	51	39	48	29	35	41	73	40		
HSP	67	50	35	61	31	35	53	83	52		
WHT	59	35		69	38						
FRL	64	49	33	58	30	34	50	81	50		
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	35	53	30	48	58	50	31				
ELL	57	67	57	67	61	44	33	70	21		
BLK	43	36		64	71						
HSP	73	67	58	79	68	52	58	81	59		
WHT	89	76		94	82						

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
FRL	71	65	57	77	67	53	56	80	56		
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	50	67	64	52	45	31		40			
ELL	43	58	52	62	59	52	35	73	15		
BLK	79	61		74	72						
HSP	72	63	52	74	54	49	64	82	55		
WHT	65	60		70	45		82				
FRL	71	62	52	73	53	47	63	81	53		

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	55
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	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	548
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

Native American Students	
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	
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	55
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	50
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	53
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?

Emerging trends include reduced progress in areas such as Math (lowest 25) to 52% Science (58%), and ELA (lowest 25) to 58%

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

Data components showing the lowest performance for the 2019 school year was in science achievement, dropping from a 65% proficiency to 58%. Contributing factors may have been due to teacher turnover during the school year, in addition to our struggling learners in subgroups (BLK, ELL & SWD).

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

Limited face-to-face contact and Remote learning severely influenced progress in these areas. Increased remote resources and educator availability for students would increase.

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

Components that showed the most improvement was in Math learning gains, with an increase now leading by 79%. This was mainly attributed to the schools use of data to provide and differentiate instruction to meet the diverse needs of our students. The implementation of our tutoring program which is offered before and after school, in addition to software such as iReady and Math XL.

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

Increased home learning and online resources were provided for those students who required extra practice. Before and after school tutoring was available school wide in all accountability groups.

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

Increased Science Program exposure and resources both online and face-to-face
Hands on experiments and data analysis
Increased practice on Gizmo

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.

Science, ELA, and Math professional development will be focused on increased critical thinking and accessibility of programs both online and in person (classroom). Strategies will include learner focus, reluctant reader encouragement, and problem solving/critical thinking in mathematics.

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

ESE Director, ESOL, and Department Leaders will construct assistance programs and RTI opportunities to improve learning and increase scores.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The decrease in achievement in Science due to the Pandemic leads the way with a low 58%. All other areas suffered a minimal amount, yet the limited time in labs, the difficulty of scientific concepts, and the non face-to face contact of students and teachers led to the low achievement in this area. Additionally, utilization of data at the classroom level is imperative to increasing student achievement as it is ever changing. Teachers need to have in-depth knowledge of the process in order for them to be able to guide and aid students in making progress towards standards mastery. Students need to be made aware of areas for growth, and held accountable for their progress as they are a crucial component to increasing their proficiency level.
Measurable Outcome:	The proposed intended outcome is to meet the needs of Mater Lakes students by utilizing the strategies that will serve the purpose of providing additional enrichment to students working below grade-level, or having difficulties on specific grade-level benchmarks in Reading. Students will benefit from being in a small group setting where their specific needs can be met. We expect scores to increase from 58% to 65% in the next year.
Monitoring:	Monitoring will begin with classroom and teacher assessments as well as some online monitoring of individual as well as cooperative learning. Tutoring sessions will also serve as monitoring tools that will define the individual plans of action for learners.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Paez (jpaez@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The intervention strategies that will be employed by Mater Lakes Academy to improve the academic performance in the areas of science will consist of our tutoring sessions, research based/ computer based learning programs such as Gizmos, Brain Pop and our curriculum Glencoe science which provides additional online resources. Moreover, applying differentiated Instruction in all classrooms (Monitored by Curriculum Instructor) will furthermore enhance student learning. Administrators and teachers alike will be provided professional development opportunities through workshops, PLCs, and lesson studies to acquire effective techniques to incorporate during all science content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	It is imperative to implement online resources as well as some face-to-face strategies as evidence shows that limited personal teaching and contact has severely affected achievement. Such strategies as differentiated instruction will provide a variety of opportunities for learners to adapt to new and effective techniques to accomplish their academic goals.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Determine Struggling Learners (Level 1 & 2)
2. Push-in/Pull-out Tutoring
3. Monitor Data/Results (e.g., in class assessments, other software used that populates assessment data)
4. Differentiated Instruction
5. Leadership Team Reviews & Take Appropriate Action

Person Responsible Jennifer Paez (jpaez@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Utilization of data at the classroom level is imperative to increasing student achievement as it is ever changing. Teachers need to have in-depth knowledge of the process in order for them to be able to guide and aid students in making progress towards standards mastery. Students need to be made aware of areas for growth, and held accountable for their progress as they are a crucial component to increasing their proficiency level. The focus will expand as well tot he Lowest 25% as they scored a limited percentage gain of 58% and should be included in the achievement increase goal.
Measurable Outcome:	In reading, we expect scores to increase to at least 65%. The intended outcome is to meet the needs of Mater Lakes students by utilizing the strategies that will serve the purpose of providing additional enrichment to students working below grade-level, or having difficulties on specific grade-level benchmarks in Reading. Students will benefit from being in a small group setting where their specific needs can be met.
Monitoring:	Teachers, tutors and department chairs will provide input at grade-level department meetings to review notes with team leaders for the purposes of targeting students that continue to struggle with grade-level text. Finally, the administrative team will monitor the data results on a monthly basis to support teachers with students who are not making adequate progress. Finally, the ESOL department chair will meet with teachers on a quarterly basis to discuss strategies and growth of the lowest 25% in ELA and ESOL.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Zahilys Aleman (zeealeman@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The intervention strategies that will be employed by Mater Lakes Academy to improve the academic performance in the area of reading for our bottom 25% category will consist of our push-in/pullout tutoring sessions, research based/computer based learning programs (iReady/ Math XL/), as well as applying differentiated Instruction in all classrooms (Monitored by Curriculum Instructors). Furthermore, administrators and teachers alike will be provided professional development opportunities through workshops, PLCs, lesson studies, and other technology based programs to acquire effective techniques to incorporate during all reading content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Researched-based strategies such as differentiated instruction and computer-based learning programs, have proven to be effective tools in the enhancement of student learning. Moreover, research shows that evidence-based teaching strategies are likely to have the largest impact on student results. Therefore, in an effort to monitor the effectiveness of the action plan, quarterly assessment, diagnostic assessments from iReady reading, mid-year baselines, will indicate student progress throughout the school year. In essence, this will provide useful insight as to the enhancement of instruction. Also, teachers will provide input at grade-level department meetings to review notes with team leaders for the purposes of targeting students that continue to struggle with grade-level text. Finally, the administrative team will monitor the data results on a monthly basis to support teachers with students who are not making adequate progress.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Determine Struggling Learners (Level 1 & 2)
2. Push-in/Pull-out Tutoring
3. Monitor Data/Results (e.g., in class assessments, other software used that populates assessment data)
4. Differentiated Instruction
5. Leadership Team Reviews & Take Appropriate Action

Person Responsible Barbara Rodriguez (954368@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.

In comparison to other schools, Mater Lakes Middle has reported 0.6 incidents per 100 students to date. This means that compared to all other middle/junior high schools statewide, MLA Middle falls into the very low category. Even at this level, we will be monitoring primary areas of concern such as ethical online use of resources as well as appropriate cyber citizenship.

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.

A fluent and open line of communication through EESAC meetings, the school website, school messenger, teacher phone calls/e-mails, social media, and other school meetings keep families informed of academic performance, community events, and parental involvement opportunities. The activities director supports the motivational and incentive programs at the school through organized school events in which the community stakeholders may also participate. School-based clubs and organizations promote their interests and strengthen relationships within the community. Communication is vital between all parties involved in our students' educational process.

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

Individuals such as the activities director, Ana Sanchez, play a significant role in promoting communication among the parents, students and the faculty and staff. Zee Aleman is also a prime example of a parent and community liaison as she is the EESAC coordinator along with Ms. Jennifer Paez who is in charge of TITLE 1. These individuals as well as the administrators who post news and events online and via school announcements aid in the communication process which leads to a healthy and effective culture and environment. Connect-ed also serves to improve the stakeholder communication and involvement in our school and culture.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$294,244.00