

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# **Table of Contents**

| School Demographics            | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 6  |
| Needs Assessment               | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

# Mater Academy East Charter School

450 SW 4TH ST, Miami, FL 33130

www.matereast.org

Demographics

# **Principal: Beatrice Riera**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/10/2002

| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Active   |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-5  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| 2021-22 Title I School  | Yes  |
| 2021-22 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3)   | 87%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an<br>asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Hispanic Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged<br>Students |
| School Grades History   | 2021-22: A (81%)<br>2018-19: A (72%)<br>2017-18: A (79%)   |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Ir  | nformation*  |
| SI Region   | Southeast  |
| Regional Executive Director   | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield   |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle   | N/A  |
| Year  |  |
| Support Tier  |  |
| ESSA Status   | N/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 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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

#### 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               | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 15 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

| Mater A  | cademy East Charte          | r School  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 45   | 50 SW 4TH ST, Miami, FL 331 | 30  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | www.matereast.org           |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| School Demographics                              |                             |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School      | 2021-22 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Elementary School<br>KG-5                        | Yes                         | 87%   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School              | (Reporte  | Minority Rate<br>ed as Non-white<br>Survey 2) |  |  |  |  |  |
| K-12 General Education                           | Yes                         |   | 97%   |  |  |  |  |  |
| School Grades History                            |                             |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 2021-22<br>Grade A                          | 2020-21                     | <b>2019-20</b><br>A   | <b>2018-19</b><br>A                           |  |  |  |  |  |
| School Board Approval                            |                             |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| NI/A   |                             |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |

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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### 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 the District is:

Mater provides a safe learning environment where Academics are facilitated by Teachers, administrators, parents, and the community which Enables students to become confident, self-directed learners in a technologically-rich college preparatory environment through Rigor, Relevance and Relationships.

Our mission is to provide our students with the necessary skills to reach their highest potential.

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

The Vision of Mater Academy, Inc. is to provide exemplary educational choices by offering an innovative college preparatory curriculum; empowering confident leaders of tomorrow.

Mater Academy East's vision is to provide a loving, caring and supportive educational environment that furthers a philosophy of respect and high expectations for all students, parents, teachers and staff.

#### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name                    | Position Title            | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Riera,<br>Beatriz       | Principal                 | Beatriz Riera is an instructional leader who sustains a shared vision for the students' academic achievement.<br>She ensures rigorous, standards-based instruction is taking place in all classrooms and supports continuous professional development opportunities for all teachers and staff members.<br>Oversees the mentor and mentee program. Additionally, she analyzes data and connects it to the instructional needs of the students at Mater Academy East. |
| Rivas,<br>Michelle      | Assistant<br>Principal    | Michelle Rivas assists in progress monitoring of at risk students. She will<br>analyze the data collected and<br>ensure proper interventions are taking place. Additionally, Ms. Rivas will<br>oversee the after school<br>tutoring program for ELL students using funds granted through Title III.  |
| Casal,<br>Joseph        | Instructional<br>Coach    | Joseph Casal meets with teachers during common planning to support the design of rigorous unit plans.<br>He provides resources and assist teachers in locating and using instructional materials that support best practices.  |
| Gomez,<br>Anette        | Instructional<br>Coach    | Anette Gomez meets with teachers during common planning to support<br>the design of rigorous unit plans.<br>She provides resources and assist teachers in locating and using<br>instructional materials that support best<br>practices.  |
| Estrada,<br>Magdalena   | Administrative<br>Support | Maggie Estrada, Staffing Specialist, will anticipate in student data<br>collection and collaborates with regular<br>education teachers while providing additional support through regular<br>consultations. Ensure IEPs, EPs and<br>504s are created and implemented.  |
| Etienne,<br>Renne       | School<br>Counselor       | Our Guidance Counselor, Renee Etienne, provides guidance services and<br>character education to our students. Ms. Etienne also oversees the<br>implementation of the Social Emotional Learning program.  |
| Charney-<br>Perez, Jaci |                           | Jaci Charney-Perez, Science/STEM Coach for K-5th grade meets with<br>teachers during common planning to<br>support the design of rigorous unit plans. She provides resources and<br>assists teachers in locating and using<br>instructional materials that support best practices.   |
| Gonzalez,<br>Natalie    |                           | Natalie Gonzalez, Science/STEM Coach for K-2nd grade, meets with teachers during common planning to  |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|------|----------------|--|
|      |                | support the design of rigorous unit plans. She provides resources and assist teachers in locating and using instructional materials that support best practices. |

#### Demographic Information

#### **Principal start date**

Tuesday 9/10/2002, Beatrice Riera

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.

20

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school 27

**Total number of students enrolled at the school** 566

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

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year. 3

**Demographic Data** 

#### Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Dade - 3100 - Mater Academy East Charter School - 2022-23 SIP |  |
|---|--|
|   |  |

| Indicator  | Grade Level |    |     |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|----|-----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | κ           | 1  | 2   | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 81          | 96 | 106 | 86 | 56 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 471   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 3  | 20  | 9  | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 1           | 0  | 16  | 8  | 2  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0   | 16 | 2  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0   | 11 | 1  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 2  | 13  | 12 | 2  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |    |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | κ           | 1  | 2  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1           | 12 | 42 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 69    |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |    |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                           | κ           | 1 | 2  | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 4           | 4 | 39 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 62    |
| 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 8/31/2022

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator  | Grade Level |    |     |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|----|-----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | κ           | 1  | 2   | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 81          | 96 | 106 | 86 | 56 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 471   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 10 | 9   | 18 | 14 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 52    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 9  | 3   | 12 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0   | 0  | 3  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0   | 0  | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 26    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 52 | 65  | 44 | 21 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 198   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | Κ           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 19 | 38 | 10 | 22 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 104   |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

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

### The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator  |    |    |     |    | Gra | de l | Lev | /el |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|----|----|-----|----|-----|------|-----|-----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator  | κ  | 1  | 2   | 3  | 4   | 5    | 6   | 7   | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 81 | 96 | 106 | 86 | 56  | 46   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 471   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0  | 10 | 9   | 18 | 14  | 1    | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 52    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0  | 9  | 3   | 12 | 11  | 10   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 3   | 6    | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 13  | 13   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 26    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0  | 52 | 65  | 44 | 21  | 16   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 198   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    | Total |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| indicator                            | Κ           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11    | 12 | TOLAT |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 19 | 38 | 10 | 22 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 104   |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

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

## 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      |        | 2022     |       |        | 2021     |       | 2019   |          |       |  |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |
| ELA Achievement             | 73%    | 62%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 81%    | 62%      | 57%   |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 84%    |          |       |        |          |       | 61%    | 62%      | 58%   |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 81%    |          |       |        |          |       | 53%    | 58%      | 53%   |  |
| Math Achievement            | 78%    | 58%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 89%    | 69%      | 63%   |  |
| Math Learning Gains         | 92%    |          |       |        |          |       | 80%    | 66%      | 62%   |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 96%    |          |       |        |          |       | 74%    | 55%      | 51%   |  |
| Science Achievement         | 66%    | 64%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 67%    | 55%      | 53%   |  |

#### 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparisor |
| 01        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 02        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 03        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 85%    | 60%      | 25%                               | 58%   | 27%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 79%    | 64%      | 15%                               | 58%   | 21%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -85%   |          |                                   | •     |                                |
| 05        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

|            |          |        | ELA      |                                   |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
|            | 2019     | 77%    | 60%      | 17%                               | 56%   | 21%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -79%   |          |                                   |       |                                |

|           |          |        | MATH     |                                   |       |                                |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade     | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparisor |
| 01        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 02        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 03        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 92%    | 67%      | 25%                               | 62%   | 30%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   | •     |                                |
| 04        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 86%    | 69%      | 17%                               | 64%   | 22%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -92%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 87%    | 65%      | 22%                               | 60%   | 27%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -86%   |          |                                   | •     |                                |

|            |         |        | SCIEN    | CE                                |       |                                |
|------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year    | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05         | 2022    |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019    | 65%    | 53%      | 12%                               | 53%   | 12%                            |
| Cohort Com | parison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

## Subgroup Data Review

|           |             | 2022      | SCHOO             | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 |
| SWD       | 63          | 92        |                   | 94           | 92         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 70          | 86        | 76                | 77           | 90         | 100                | 58          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 72          | 84        | 81                | 78           | 93         | 96                 | 66          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 72          | 85        | 81                | 77           | 92         | 96                 | 65          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 29          |           |                   | 33           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |

|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| ELL       | 58          | 49        | 33                | 39           | 22         |                    | 40          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 62          | 46        | 27                | 43           | 24         | 7                  | 41          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 60          | 42        | 27                | 39           | 18         | 7                  | 36          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 79          | 45        |                   | 86           | 91         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 80          | 60        | 57                | 91           | 83         | 82                 | 70          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 81          | 61        | 53                | 89           | 79         | 73                 | 67          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 80          | 59        | 53                | 89           | 79         | 72                 | 67          |            |              |                         |                           |

### ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | N/A  |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 81   |
| 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 | 79   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 649  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |

| Students With Disabilities  |    |  |
|---|----|--|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                | 85 |  |
| 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                                 | 80 |  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         |    |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%  | 0  |  |
| 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%            | 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  | 81  |
| 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                                | 81  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### 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?

Based on progress monitoring data from 2022, there was an overall increase in reading from a 29% in the fall to a 63% in the spring. There was an overall increase in math from a 15% in the fall to a 69%. Based on 2022 FSA data in comparison to 2021 FSA data, there was an increase in our economically disadvantaged subgroup for ELA from a 60% to a 72%. There was an increase in our ESE subgroup for ELA from a 29% to a 63%. There was an increase in our ESOL subgroup for ELA from a 58% to a 70%. Based on 2022 FSA data in comparison to 2021 FSA data, there was an increase in our economically disadvantaged subgroup for Math from a 39% to a 77%. There was an increase in our ESE subgroup for Math from a 39% to a 77%. There was an increase in our ESE subgroup for Math from a 39% to a 77%.

Additionally, based on 2022 FSA data in comparison to 2021 FSA data, reading increased from a 61% to a 74%. Math increased from a 42% to a 77%. There was an increase in Science achievement from a 38% to a 62%.

# What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data component that demonstrates the greatest need for improvement is science based on the 21-22 FCAT assessment results.

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

A contributing factor to our need for improvement is that students lack sufficient background knowledge on scientific terms. New actions the school will take to address the need for improvement are providing high quality instruction and curriculum alignment to state-mandated standards.

# What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on 2021-2022 progress monitoring data the data component that showed the most improvement was Math from 15% proficiency in the Fall and 69% proficiency in the Spring. Based on 2022 FSA data the data component that showed the most improvement was Math from from a 42% to a 77%.

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

This improvement can be credited to high quality instruction, curriculum alignment to state-mandated standards, and the school's after-school academic enrichment program.

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

In order to accelerate learning, the school will provide high quality instruction, curriculum alignment to state-mandated standards, after-school academic enrichment program and differentiated instruction.

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

The professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school will be for curriculum and instruction, differentiated instruction and using data to drive instruction.

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

In order to ensure sustainability of improvement, professional developments will continuously take place through out the school year. Reading coaches and curriculum coaches will provide support to teachers through grade level meetings. Monthly leadership meetings will take place to analyze data and plan for instruction tailored to student areas for growth.

#### Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

#### **#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

| Area of Focus Description<br>and Rationale:<br>Include a rationale that<br>explains how it was<br>identified as a critical need<br>from the data reviewed.                              | Science was identified as the area with the lowest proficiency for the 21-22 school year.   |
|---|---|
| Measurable Outcome:<br>State the specific<br>measurable outcome the<br>school plans to achieve.<br>This should be a data<br>based, objective outcome.                                   | Science proficiency will increase to 70% for the 2022-2023 school year.   |
| Monitoring:<br>Describe how this Area of<br>Focus will be monitored for<br>the desired outcome.   | The administration will review all data from student assessments to monitor student progress.   |
| Person responsible for<br>monitoring outcome:   | Michelle Rivas (934755@dadeschools.net)   |
| Evidence-based Strategy:<br>Describe the evidence-<br>based strategy being<br>implemented for this Area<br>of Focus.  | Provide students with opportunities to design and develop science and<br>engineering projects to increase scientific thinking and the development of<br>inquiry based activities that promote higher order thinking skills.<br>Implementation of Science Weekly and STEM projects featuring science<br>concepts/terms and technology, as<br>well as age appropriate current events. |
| Rationale for Evidence-<br>based Strategy:<br>Explain the rationale for<br>selecting this specific<br>strategy. Describe the<br>resources/criteria used for<br>selecting this strategy. | Students will enhance their ability to identify key terms/concepts and increase student achievement.  |
| Action Steps to Implement<br>List the action steps that will be<br>person responsible for monitor   | e taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the<br>ring each step   |

Provide students with opportunities to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking and the development of inquiry based activities that promote higher order thinking skills. Implementation of Science Weekly, featuring science concepts/terms and technology, as well as age appropriate current events.

**Person Responsible** 

Jaci Charney-Perez (jperez@matereast.com)

## RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
  Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

#### Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

n/a

#### Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

n/a

#### Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

#### Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

#### Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

#### Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

n/a

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

#### **Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidencebased Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

#### n/a

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- · Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

#### n/a

#### Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

**Person Responsible for Monitoring** 

n/a

### **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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

One of the strategies that we find effective in engaging and motivating students is to hold events and field trips that reward student success and positive behavior. We plan school-wide pep rallies and assemblies that motivate and celebrate the hard work students put forth throughout the school year

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

Teachers and staff at Mater Academy East (MAE) work together on a common set of beliefs and values to provide a school culture that promotes a positive learning environment which maximizes students' ability to learn. For example, MAE employs a full-time school counselor that plays a vital role in helping all students in the areas of academic achievement, but also career, social and emotional development. Character education has played a pivotal role in the school counselor's commitment to promoting a continuous learning process that enables

our students to become moral, caring, and responsible individuals. MAE prides itself in bringing parents, families, and communities together to create a trusting environment. Family engagement continues to be at the forefront of the school's efforts to achieve student success. Part of its success has been attributed to its parental volunteer

program, the goal of which, is to encourage families to be part of their child's education by participating in school related activities such as becoming a room parent, reading to the class, attending field trips, and organizing special events. With our designation of being a Title I school, MAE has a full-time community involvement

specialist (CIS) that serves as a bridge between the home and the school. The CIS is tasked with providing informational workshops to parents, surveying the community to target areas of critical need, and performs home visits to ensure the welfare of students and families in times of need. The CIS also maintains the Title I Parent Center. This center provides parents with flyers, coupons, monthly calendar of activities, school news, a laptop computer, as well as informational texts that are available for checkout. Lastly, MAE's Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) is responsible for final decision making at the school as it relates to the implementation of the components of the School Performance Excellence Plan. The EESAC committee is comprised of the principal, teachers, educational support employees, students, parents, and business/community

representatives. The EESAC's function is to bring together all stakeholders and involve them in an authentic role in decisions that affect instruction and the delivery of programs. The EESAC committee is one of the key components in MAE's ability to effectively engage families and the community in a way that truly impacts student success. MAE has had a long-standing relationship with community partners such as City of Miami Parks and Recreation, McDonalds, Common Threads and Amigos for Kids. It is through these partnerships, such as Amigos for Kids, that Mater Academy East is able to offer workshops to educate parents and families on best practices in parenting. Additionally, Mater Academy East has developed

relationships with MMA dragon, UF, and Be Present Yoga & Wellness through our on going STEM program.