Imater Academy Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Imater Academy Middle School

651 W 20TH ST, Hialeah, FL 33010

www.materacademy.com

Demographics

Principal: Teresa Santalo

Start Date for this Principal: 9/9/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
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: A (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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

Imater Academy Middle School

651 W 20TH ST, Hialeah, FL 33010

www.materacademy.com

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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	93%

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	A	A	B	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.

Our mission is to provide a challenging educational curriculum which promotes critical thinking skills and individual artistic expression through a balance of tradition and innovation.

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, skills, and attitudes necessary for meaningful and productive lives as artists, designers, and citizens of the world. iMater is a collaborative teaching and learning environment that encourages students to develop meaningful interactions across the visual & performing arts and other disciplines.

•Support curriculum integration where students use appropriate, real world technologies that foster high achievement, independent problem solving and global participation.
•Support on-going, timely professional development where staff learns to integrate technology into the curriculum, manage data technologies, and explore new technologies as they affect teaching and learning.
•Engage the community in technology partnerships through increased communication with stake holders, shared resources, and work with institutions of high education, libraries and businesses.
•Support an infrastructure that includes up to date hardware, software and modern peripherals so that the curriculum can be easily integrated.
•Provide support systems such as personnel, operations, management, and other systems that support teaching and learning.

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
Santalo, Teresa	Principal	
Garcia, Densie	Assistant Principal	
Reyes, Esther	Assistant Principal	
Novoa, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
Torres, Jaime	Teacher, K-12	
Salazar, Monique	Teacher, K-12	
Robinson, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	
Valdes, Carmen	Teacher, K-12	
Carter, Angel	School Counselor	
Miguelez, Alicia	Instructional Coach	
Pino, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Castrillon, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	
Valentine, Hazel	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 9/9/2020, Teresa Santalo

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
34

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%

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: A (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	273	282	287	0	0	0	0	842
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	17	18	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	1	6	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	103	133	0	0	0	0	307
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	83	106	0	0	0	0	234

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	45	64	89	0	0	0	0	198

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	3	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/9/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	284	281	263	0	0	0	0	828
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	24	21	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	15	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	190	239	162	0	0	0	0	591

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	64	90	55	0	0	0	0	209

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	2	0	0	0	0	2
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	284	281	263	0	0	0	0	828
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	24	21	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	15	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	190	239	162	0	0	0	0	591

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	64	90	55	0	0	0	0	209

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	2	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
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	58%	58%	54%	58%	53%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	58%	54%	57%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	52%	47%	48%	48%	44%
Math Achievement	67%	58%	58%	70%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	59%	56%	57%	70%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	54%	51%	68%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	54%	52%	51%	47%	50%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	74%	72%	77%	70%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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
06	2019	51%	58%	-7%	54%	-3%
	2018	55%	53%	2%	52%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	61%	56%	5%	52%	9%
	2018	51%	54%	-3%	51%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	61%	60%	1%	56%	5%
	2018	59%	59%	0%	58%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	61%	58%	3%	55%	6%
	2018	71%	56%	15%	52%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	74%	53%	21%	54%	20%
	2018	68%	52%	16%	54%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	35%	40%	-5%	46%	-11%
	2018	40%	38%	2%	45%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	40%	43%	-3%	48%	-8%
	2018	9%	44%	-35%	50%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		31%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	66%	68%	-2%	67%	-1%
2018	78%	65%	13%	65%	13%
Compare		-12%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	73%	8%	71%	10%
2018	70%	72%	-2%	71%	-1%
Compare		11%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	76%	63%	13%	61%	15%
2018	66%	59%	7%	62%	4%
Compare		10%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	100%	54%	46%	56%	44%

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	29	45	48	40	52	37	38				
ELL	46	63	59	56	56	54	40	70	86		
HSP	58	63	59	66	59	52	53	81	87		
FRL	58	64	60	66	59	53	54	81	87		
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	12	36	31	36	36	50		50			
ELL	28	48	49	51	53	54	19	44	92		
HSP	56	54	47	66	56	60	50	71	84		
WHT	77	69		69	69						
FRL	56	54	48	66	55	61	49	70	86		
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	25	42	50	56	52						

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
ELL	27	47	44	52	66	70	17	51	63		
HSP	59	58	48	71	71	68	47	77	68		
FRL	58	58	49	69	70	69	47	77	68		

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	65
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	646
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	59
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

Asian Students	
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	64
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
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	65
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 which showed the lowest performance was Math Lowest 25%. Low tutoring attendance was one of the contributing factors to last year's low performance.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year was also Math Lowest 25%. In addition to low tutoring attendance, teacher not targeting those student carefully also contributed to this decline.

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.

iMater Academy Middle School scored higher than the State of Florida in all categories. Our greatest gap (favorable) was in ELA Lowest 25%. We scored 12 percentage points higher than the state.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was ELA Lowest 25%. Teachers worked hard at targeting their lowest 25%. The use of the iReady Online Instructional Curriculum helped to not only supplement their curriculum, but also provide additional data to target learning gaps.

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

Reflecting on our Early Warning Signs, one area of concern is that of students scoring Level 1 on statewide assessments.

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

1. Increase Learning Gains in the Lowest 25% in Math
2. Increase Learning Gains in the Lowest 25% in ELA
3. Increase Science Achievement in both Biology and 8th FCAT Science
4. Improve Attendance Rates
5. Improve Students Arriving Late and Leaving Early

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our area of focus is Mathematics, specifically our lowest 25th percent. Our Math Lowest 25th percentile score decreased 8 percentage points from a 61% in 2018 to a 53% in 2019.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase our Math Lowest 25th Percentile score by at least 7 percentage points reaching a 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jaime Torres (jtorres@imater.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The use of the i-Ready Online Diagnostic tool will be used to pinpoint students' strengths and knowledge gaps in mathematics. It automatically groups students and offers targeted instructional recommendations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The data from the i-Ready Diagnostic tool provides teachers with a deeper knowledge of their students' needs. Data reports provide both teachers and administrators the informative needed so they can work toward the goal of student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Classroom Walk-throughs
2. Lesson Plans
3. Tutoring Attendance Rosters
4. Midyear Assessments
5. i-Ready Progress Monitoring Reports

Person Responsible	Jaime Torres (jtorres@imater.org)

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 meet monthly to review and address the remaining school-wide improvement priorities of: Learning Gains in the Lowest 25th Percentile in ELA, Science Achievement, Attendance, and Tardiness.

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 Middle School works at building positive relationships with families to increase involvement , including efforts to communicate the school's mission and vision, and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

Parents are kept informed through our school's website, www.imater.org, our Facebook page, and our Instagram page. We also send messages using School Messenger (email, text, and phone messages).

Bilingual Parent Academies are also offered to inform and instruct parents on topic relevant to their child's education.

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: Math				$36,395.35
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		120-Classroom Teachers	6014 - Imater Academy Middle School	Title, I Part A	842.0	$12,000.00
			Notes: After school and Saturday Tutoring			
		399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	6014 - Imater Academy Middle School	Title, I Part A	842.0	$10,560.00
			Notes: i-Ready Math Online Diagnostic Tool			
		510-Supplies	6014 - Imater Academy Middle School	Title, I Part A	842.0	$13,835.35
			Notes: Educational Development Associates (Math Quick Pik) School Specialty (FL Coach Math)			
					Total:	$36,395.35