Mater International Academy

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mater International Academy

3405 NW 27TH AVE, Miami, FL 33142

www.materinternational.com

Demographics

Principal: Olga Camarena

Start Date for this Principal: 8/31/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (51%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: A (63%)
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	ATSI
* 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

Mater International Academy

3405 NW 27TH AVE, Miami, FL 33142

www.materinternational.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	95%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	100%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	B

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 Mater International Academy is to develop the intellectual, social, and bilingual skills of its students in a nurturing and safe environment, through innovative and creative teaching methods, thus producing lifelong learners who respect diversity.

.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision of Mater International Academy is to provide students a viable educational choice that offers an innovative, rigorous, and seamless college preparatory curriculum, providing Mater students, at every level from PK-12th grade, with a competitive advantage against their contemporaries. To that end, Mater International Academy strive to:

• create a thirst for knowledge in all disciplines;
• kindle the art of thinking and serve as a springboard for lifelong learning; and
• deliver and enrich every student with a sense of purpose, a belief in their own efficacy, and a commitment to the common good.

School Leadership Team

Membership
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
Camarena, Olga	Principal	Principal will meet with the school leadership team on a weekly basis in order to discuss any updates/changes to academic programs. Ms. Camarena will serve as an instructional leader by guiding her staff to become active members in the decision making regarding student achievement. -Overall day-to-day school operations -Curriculum Decisions -Purchasing Decisions -Facilities Enhancements -School Budget/approves all purchases -SACS/AdvancED -School Wellness Plans -School Improvement Plan (SIP) -Parent concerns -Building maintenance -Faculty meetings -Crisis management -Fire Alarm Contact -Annual School Accountability Report -Personnel Issues Evaluations/ Supervision -IPGP - Title I Program requirements -Conflict Resolution -Discipline -EESAC -Student Retentions -Threat Assessment Team -FSSA Safety and Security -SESIR
Torres, Jessica	Instructional Coach	Lead Teacher and Reading Coach will be attending the district meetings and professional developments. She will relay the information to teachers and administrators after the meetings. -Curriculum Planning/Data Driven/Evidence Based -Professional Development per subject -Analyze data and diagnose student needs per grade levels -Guide grade level planning and meetings -Conduct classroom walkthroughs of all teachers and offer support where needed and students, coaching -Model engaging, standard-based lessons as needed -Collaborate with grade level and address needs -Guidance with instructional resources -Attend district and Mater, Inc reading coaches meetings -Debrief and model new strategies -Assist administration with any request as needed -I-Ready Program- Reading & Math -Book Fair School Events -Mater Spelling Bee

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		-Master Schedules -Member of Threat Assessment Team -Test Chair
Boyd, Donna	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Chair will be attending the district meetings and professional developments. She will relay the information to teachers and administrators after the meetings.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 8/31/2022, Olga Camarena

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.*
10

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.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
10

Total number of students enrolled at the school
201

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
1

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:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	28	32	43	39	27	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	7	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	19	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	19	8	15	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	26	40	37	38	34	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	205
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	3	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	13	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	11	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	11	13	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	26	40	37	38	34	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	205
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	3	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	13	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	11	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	11	13	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	45%	62%	56%				54%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	68%						56%	62%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%							58%	53%
Math Achievement	33%	58%	50%				61%	69%	63%
Math Learning Gains	50%						44%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%							55%	51%
Science Achievement	29%	64%	59%					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-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	51%	60%	-9%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	64%	-6%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	62%	67%	-5%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	69%	-6%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD				15							
ELL	38	70	64	36	58		19				
HSP	45	69	63	34	50	67	29				
FRL	43	68	63	33	50	69	26				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
ELL	34	22		34	22		19				
HSP	36	33		33	20		21				
FRL	35	34		31	19		20				
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
ELL	51			63							
HSP	57	59		65	47						
FRL	54	56		61	44						

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	52
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	52
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?

The data component which showed the lowest performance was Math Achievement. The contributing factors to last year's low performance came from many factors which attributed to the decline in Math Achievement. The primary reason which contributed to the decline in Math Achievement was based on student foundational deficiencies.

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

The data component which showed the greatest decline from the previous school years was Math achievement. Math achievement in 2020 was 56% and dropped to 33% in 2022. Factors which attributed to the decline include low foundational deficiencies, staff turnover, and a high level of English language learners and the COVID-19 Pandemic.

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

Our biggest contributing factor to this need for improvement was the fact that the 2021-2022 school year our school implemented the hybrid instructional model. For the current school year we have opened our school for 100% face to face instruction and implementing our intervention plan for our lowest 25% percentile students.

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

Looking at the I-Ready data through out the different diagnostics administered in English Language Arts students showed the most improvement in Phonics, Vocabulary, and Comprehension in Literature. In mathematics Algebra with Algebraic Thinking, and Number and Operations showed improvement across all grade levels.

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

After analyzing the Fall Diagnostic data and the state allowing schools to admit more students in the building following several COVID-19 prevention measures we were able to invite back several of our students to Brick and Mortar. Teachers were able to dedicate small group instruction and intervention strategies to implement curriculum

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

PLTW strategies/Project Based Learning will be implemented in all grade levels and all subject areas; we want to prepare our students with 21st century skills. Due to the pandemic we will also be fully implementing Social Emotional Learning curriculum to reach all students as a whole. The intervention plan for reading will include SPED and ESOL accommodations, Tier 3 students will be using a Phonics curriculum for Reading and Easy CBM for Data Collection. For mathematics teachers will focus on word problem strategies as well as intervention with their lowest 25% students population based on assessment data.

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 Doral Leadership Institute has created a professional development database where professional developments will be offered to our teachers. Several of the workshops that will be available for teachers will be provided in house via teacher inquiry

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

1. Math Learning Gain
2. Math Proficiency
3. Retained Students making learning gains
4. Students with a Level 1 making adequate learning gains
5. Reading Learning Gains.

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 ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on 2022 data and the Florida Transition Timeline this school year ELA will have the new B.E.S.T Standards being implemented into the curriculum, ELA scores were at a overall 44% student achievement and we have identified it as a critical need for improvement and area of focus for the 22-23 school year. Teachers will target Language Arts and reading strategies. Students will have numerous opportunities to practice targeted activities through direct and small group instruction in order to improve academic achievement levels.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	All teachers will participate in Professional Developments in both ELA and Mathematics to understand, familiarize and implement B.E.S.T. Standards in their classrooms and curriculum.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Teachers will provide proof of enrolling in B.E.S.T. standard professional development to the Lead Teacher whether it be via Miami Dade County Public Schools or Mater Academy Inc.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Torres (jtorres@materinternationalacademy.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Small group instructions, Wonders Bi-Weeklies, I-Ready, Implementation Guide for Mathematics, and Topic Assessments. Differentiated instruction will be implemented as well in order to make sure to target on areas of focus based on topic and bi-weekly assessments. I-Ready is the evidence based technology program, which we continue to use to instruct and support students at their individualized levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for	I-Ready is an evidence based program that will ensure that the students are working within their individual academic level. Additionally, each student will be able to work towards their growth target to achieve higher skills in reading and language arts.. Due to the integration of the new B.E.S.T. Standards in both subject areas teachers will be participating in professional developments and will be provided with guidance and mentoring from the instructional coach and lead teacher. Integrating the B.E.S.T.

selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.
standards throughout content areas will provide students with additional opportunities to master standards and academic vocabulary.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The Lead Teacher will check lesson plans on a weekly basis to ensure that teachers are planning based on grade level standards and including rigorous, inquiry based activities.

Person Responsible
Jessica Torres (jtorres@materinternationalacademy.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Based on 2022 data, math scores were at a overall 33% student learning gains and we have identified it as a critical need for improvement and area of focus for the 22-23 school year. Teachers will target math. Students will have numerous opportunities to practice targeted activities through direct and small group instruction in order to improve academic achievement levels and learning gains.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Teachers will incorporate additional math foundational skills in order to increase math achievement by 10% . Students will have numerous opportunities to engage in targeted based math activities and small group instruction that target deficiencies in mathematical knowledge.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	I-Ready diagnostics and progress monitoring, implementation of Reflex Math school wide, district bell ringers and topic assessments with data excel sheet which is provided to the administration team and analyzed during data chats.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Torres (jtorres@materinternationalacademy.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Teachers will use the Go Math curriculum and the iReady Sequencing guide to target math objectives and grade level expectations. Additionally, teachers will incorporate reading skills in order to target word problem comprehension and solving skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Integrating reading skills throughout math instruction and BEST standards will provide students with additional opportunities to master math standards and best practices; as well as, academic vocabulary.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The Lead Teacher will observe teachers incorporating reading strategies, in order to target academic word problem skills, such as circling numbers and underlining key words and the questions.

Person Responsible	Jessica Torres (jtorres@materinternationalacademy.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

Based on the 2021-2022 SAT Reading scores first and second grade are in need of critical reading intervention. Frist grade scored a 74% overall reading proficiency. Second grade scored an overall 55% in reading proficiency. Our current second and third graders will need explicit interventions in key domains of reading such as fluency and vocabulary.

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

Based on the 2021-2022 FSA ELA assessment third grade scored at a 32% overall proficiency. These students have a critical need in reading fluency and reading comprehension explicit instruction.

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)

On the FAST STAR Reading assessment, students in first grade will score at an overall reading proficiency of 45%.

On the FAST STAR Reading assessment, students in second grade will score at an overall reading proficiency of 30%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

On the FAST Reading assessment, students in third grade will score at an overall 40% reading proficiency.

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.

The Areas of Focus will be monitored by the reading coach and administrative team throughout the year. This will be done by analyzing and dissecting data from bi-weekly assessments, Diagnostics, and FAST progress monitoring results in the Fall and Winter. Data chats will be done on a quarterly basis with teachers to discuss best practices. Data driven instruction will be monitored by the administrative team and coaches by checking lesson plans and conducting walk throughs. If needed, our reading coach will provide mentoring and modeling to teachers. The tutoring program will also target the needs of our most vulnerable students and help close learning gaps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Torres, Jessica, jtorres@materinternationalacademy.com

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. Â§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 Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

One evidence based practice and program that we will be using to improve student outcomes is the implementation of i-Ready with fidelity. i-Ready meets Florida's definition of evidence-based practices as promising and align with the BEST ELA Standards.

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?

i-Ready was chosen because it addresses the needs of each individual student at their level. The program targets the needs of each student based on the students completion of a diagnostic and their individualized direct path of lessons.

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
The leadership team identified the student in need by analyzing their 2021-2022 i-Ready AP3, SAT and FSA data. These students will be placed in the appropriate Tier for additional interventions.	Torres, Jessica, jtorres@materinternationalacademy.com
Students will complete their Fall assessments including FAST Reading and i-Ready Diagnostic AP1. Using the most updated data, the literacy leadership team and teachers will conduct their first data chat to begin implementing an explicit reading plan to close learning gaps.	Torres, Jessica, jtorres@materinternationalacademy.com

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.

Our goal is to have the percentage of parents involved in school activities to 70%. Limited knowledge of the English language is a barrier in providing knowledge of activities. Communication will be sent in English and Spanish for all parent activities. Activities will be conducted in both languages. Modes of communication have been expanded to include school-wide mass text messaging through school messenger service to remind parents of important information and upcoming events, both in English and Spanish. Principal will monitor implementation and review sign in sheets to determine the number of parents attending school or community events for effectiveness. Progress will be determined by analyzing sign in sheets for parent participation.

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

Reudel Campos - EESAC Parent Representative
Cinthia Andrade - EESAC Parent Representative
Enrique Pacheco - Business Community Representative