

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Imater Academy



2020-21 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 | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 15 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 16 |

Imater Academy

600 W 20TH ST, Hialeah, FL 33010

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Elizabeth Poveda

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 93% |
| 2019-20 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 Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: C (47%) |
| 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 | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

N/A

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 | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 16 |

Imater Academy

600 W 20TH ST, Hialeah, FL 33010

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School KG-5 | Yes | 94% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | Yes | 99% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B | B | C | A |

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of iMater Elementary is to develop the intellectual and social skills of its students by facilitating a rigorous curriculum, which integrates technology and a wide range of educational resources within a safe learning environment. Students are expected to perform at or above grade level availing success in elementary in order to produce lifelong learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a structured, creative environment that enables students to ask questions, solve problems, and take risks as they gain the knowledge and skills necessary to achieve meaningful and productive lives as members of the global society. iMater is a collaborative teaching and learning environment that encourages students to develop meaningful interactions using technology integrated throughout the curriculum.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Cordoves, Stephanie | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Hernandez, Patricia | Instructional Coach | |
| Piedra, Madeleine | Teacher, ESE | |
| Poveda, Elizabeth | Principal | |
| Rodriguez, Elaine | Assistant Principal | |
| Nunez-Goolsby, Vanessa | Instructional Coach | |
| Castro, Chrizia | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Barrios, Erica | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Guerrero, Isis | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Cidcosta, Nayla | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Debasa, Ines | Teacher, K-12 | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Elizabeth Poveda

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

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 93% |
| 2019-20 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 Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: C (47%) |
| 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 | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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 | 3 | 8 | 12 | 34 | 33 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

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 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 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 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/8/2020

Prior Year - 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 | 1 | 15 | 19 | 13 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
| 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 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 14 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 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 | |

Prior Year - 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 | 1 | 15 | 19 | 13 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
| 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 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 14 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 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 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

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 | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 67% | 62% | 57% | 60% | 57% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 62% | 62% | 58% | 60% | 61% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 55% | 58% | 53% | 55% | 58% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 65% | 69% | 63% | 71% | 66% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 62% | 66% | 62% | 71% | 65% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 51% | 55% | 51% | 53% | 57% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 55% | 55% | 53% | 63% | 52% | 51% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

Grade Level Data

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 | 2019 | 69% | 60% | 9% | 58% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 67% | 61% | 6% | 57% | 10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 60% | 64% | -4% | 58% | 2% |
| | 2018 | 63% | 60% | 3% | 56% | 7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 66% | 60% | 6% | 56% | 10% |
| | 2018 | 54% | 59% | -5% | 55% | -1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 69% | 67% | 2% | 62% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 67% | 67% | 0% | 62% | 5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 58% | 69% | -11% | 64% | -6% |
| | 2018 | 56% | 68% | -12% | 62% | -6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 62% | 65% | -3% | 60% | 2% |
| | 2018 | 64% | 66% | -2% | 61% | 3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 54% | 53% | 1% | 53% | 1% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 65% | 56% | 9% | 55% | 10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 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 | 32 | 58 | 47 | 25 | 42 | 43 | | | | | |
| ELL | 63 | 69 | 58 | 62 | 61 | 55 | 56 | | | | |
| HSP | 66 | 62 | 55 | 65 | 62 | 50 | 56 | | | | |
| FRL | 66 | 62 | 55 | 65 | 63 | 51 | 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 | 28 | 45 | 40 | 25 | 32 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 52 | 54 | 49 | 51 | 37 | 29 | 38 | | | | |
| HSP | 63 | 61 | 52 | 63 | 39 | 27 | 69 | | | | |
| FRL | 63 | 61 | 52 | 62 | 39 | 26 | 68 | | | | |
| 2017 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 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 33 | 75 | | 57 | 58 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 48 | 58 | 68 | 64 | 71 | 54 | 44 | | | | |
| BLK | 40 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 61 | 60 | 55 | 72 | 71 | 54 | 64 | | | | |
| FRL | 59 | 61 | 55 | 71 | 72 | 53 | 63 | | | | |

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 62 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 76 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 493 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 44 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 63 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 62 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 62 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance in the i-Ready Diagnostic AP3 test was Reading. The contributing factors for the low performance in reading shows the highest deficiency in reading comprehension of informational text.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Through iReady data, there was an evident decline in students working at or above grade level in reading comprehension of informational text. The factors contributing to the decline in student performance are our students demographics, family socioeconomic status, and language barriers within the families.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

It was determined that reading comprehension of informational text had the greatest gap compared to those tier 1 students. A factor that may impact student performance is the language barriers. Many students have difficulties comprehending and using the reading strategies effectively.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The schools leadership team met and analyzed the data and determined that the phonological awareness and phonics demonstrated the most improvement with the 2019-2020 iReady Diagnostic ELA Assessment. During the 2019-2020 school year, iMater Elementary implemented a variety of ELA strategies that focused on phonological awareness and phonics strategies to help students master these skills. For example, the students participated three times a week on SuccessMaker Activities, differentiated instruction activities, and other center based activities that focused on phonological awareness and phonics activities.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Reflecting on the Early Warning System it is evident that our potential concerns lie within our fourth grade students who demonstrate many areas of weaknesses within the reading and math curriculum. We are targeting the area of reading comprehension of informational text due to our observations and iReady data demonstrating deficiencies in the area. By using this component as our greatest weakness it will allow us to remediate and close gaps across ELA content areas.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Reading Comprehension of Informational Text
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | iMater Academy's goal is to improve and increase student achievement in the areas of Comprehension Informational Text. Based on i-Ready Diagnostic (AP3), our students are not adequately prepared to independently target these textual contents. |
| Measurable Outcome: | iMater Academy plans to improve our overall focus on Comprehension Informational Text to ensure our students' data reflects at grade level or above. We plan to implement various ELA structured strategies and rigorous instruction that will assist our students to comprehend and dissect the textual information. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Patricia Hernandez (phernandez3@dadeschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Teachers will attend various Professional Developments relating to improving rigorous instruction within the ELA classroom. Classroom instruction will be centered around Differentiated Instruction in order to close academic gaps and meet student needs on a more individualized setting. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Teachers require additional assistance implementing adequate lessons that are grade level appropriate involving reading and dissecting texts. |

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The school leadership team will ensure our school's academic priorities are being met by meeting with our teachers on a weekly basis, taking part in classroom observations to monitor instruction, providing resources to our teachers and students, providing tutoring opportunities, and delivering individualized tier 2 and tier 3 interventions throughout the school day.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

iMater Academy plans to continue to offer our parents and families opportunities for engagement virtually and through our brick and mortar setting. Parents and guardians will be offered various resources and engagement opportunities in order to be an essential component in their child's academic achievements.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$40,993.76 |
|---|----------|---|--|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5100 | 390-Other Purchased Services | 5384 - Imater Academy | School Improvement Funds | | \$3,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Teachers will receive additional training in the requirements needs for Reading. For example, the use of rigorous curriculum and lessons, meeting student needs through differentiated instruction and real world connections. | | | |
| | 5100 | 390-Other Purchased Services | 5384 - Imater Academy | Title, I Part A | | \$22,940.00 |
| | | | Notes: iReady along with the curriculum specialist will provide Professional Development training for teachers to integrate the iReady program for Diagnostic Assessments, Progress Monitoring and Tier III Data. | | | |
| | 1382 | 690-Computer Software | 5384 - Imater Academy | Title, I Part A | | \$9,900.00 |
| | | | Notes: The computer based program "SuccessMaker" has been purchased to help provide additional support to students in the Reading and Math area. The program will also provide data for teachers to help align in their instruction with the needs of the student. | | | |
| | 1382 | 690-Computer Software | 5384 - Imater Academy | Title, I Part A | | \$5,153.76 |
| | | | Notes: Top Score Writing is an online writing curriculum that increases students performance and overall test scores in writing skills. | | | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$40,993.76 |