Mater Grove Academy School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Mater Grove Academy

2805 SW 32ND AVE, Miami, FL 33133

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our Mission is to provide a loving, caring, and supportive educational environment, where the whole child is developed and a philosophy of respect and high expectations is instilled for all students, parents, teachers, and staff.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Mater we will strive to create a thirst for knowledge in all disciplines of the curriculum 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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Caleo, Sheila	Parent Engagement Liaison	Sheila Caleo's role as principal is to provide the school with a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensuring that the school-based team is implementing a multi-tiered system of support, and conducting assessments on the effectiveness of the implementation through observation, documentation, and analysis of data. Additionally, she provides the staff with opportunities for professional development and communicates with all stakeholders regarding the school's goals and objectives, and the plans put in place to achieve those desirable outcomes.
Toledo, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	Elizabeth Toledo provides the data for the principal and instructional coaches in order to facilitate data chats with the teachers. The assistant principal also seeks to find the instructional programs and classroom materials that will best address the needs of learners in an effort to help close learning gaps.
Paz, Raquel	Instructional Coach	The instructional coaches support the school goals by meeting with teachers to discuss their student data and identify trends that should be addressed. They provide instructional support to the teachers through collaborative lesson planning, modeling, and guiding the selection process for small group instruction. Instructional coaches meet often with teachers to provide feedback on the progress being made by their respective students.
Diaz, Samantha	Instructional Coach	The instructional coaches support the school goals by meeting with teachers to discuss their student data and identify trends that should be addressed. They provide instructional support to the teachers through collaborative lesson planning, modeling, and guiding the selection process for small group instruction. Instructional coaches meet often with teachers to provide feedback on the progress being made by their respective students.
Drennan, Amanda	Instructional Coach	The instructional coaches support the school goals by meeting with teachers to discuss their student data and identify trends that should be addressed. They provide instructional support to the teachers through collaborative lesson planning, modeling, and guiding the selection process for small group instruction. Instructional coaches meet often with teachers to provide feedback on the progress being made by their respective students.
Suarez, Alain	Dean	The Dean of students helps monitor student's academics as well as behavior. Their duty includes providing support for students, addressing student behavior and coordinating schedules. They provide student orientations regarding important school policies as well as student safety.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The SIP is reviewed with all stakeholders during our EESAC meetings. During these meetings, we analyze student data and identify the needs of our students. We discuss what new curriculum or strategies we will use to close learning gaps.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The implementation of effective teaching practices and goals listed in the SIP, will be regularly monitored by the instructional coaches. They will be planning with the teachers every other week to ensure the teachers are using the new curriculum to help student achievement. Data chats will take place after every progress monitoring assessment to analyze if students are making learning gains.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	96%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	19%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	25	20	9	2	6	9	12	13	1	97
One or more suspensions	1	2	3	5	5	19	13	25	27	100
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	9	12	5	8	1	10	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	6	7	5	4	1	1	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	6	9	19	9	18	93
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	14	18	7	7	7	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	139	144	29	15	24	1	48	26	426

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	2	11	1	1	1	2	2	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	65	61	53	66	62	55	64		
ELA Learning Gains				63			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			47		
Math Achievement*	77	63	55	63	51	42	54		
Math Learning Gains				69			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			25		
Science Achievement*	53	56	52	47	60	54	43		
Social Studies Achievement*	89	77	68	66	68	59	63		
Middle School Acceleration	83	75	70	75	61	51	47		
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	69	62	55	63	75	70	56		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	495
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	623
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	51			
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	62			
HSP	70			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	84			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	**Federal Percent of Points Index**	**Subgroup Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%**
FRL	65			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	**Federal Percent of Points Index**	**Subgroup Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%**
SWD	45			
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	2	
HSP	63			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	57			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22**	**C & C Accel 2021-22**	**ELP Progress**
All Students	65			77			53	89	83			69
SWD	42			60			21	70			6	63
ELL	45			70			35	84			6	69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	54			69							2	
HSP	65			77			53	89	81		7	69
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	76			92							2	
FRL	58			74			58	93	83		7	53

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	66	63	55	63	69	56	47	66	75			63
SWD	36	46	60	36	54	38	31					55
ELL	48	58	53	50	64	56	26	50	40			63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	50		19	36							
HSP	67	64	56	64	70	58	47	67	76			63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	77	36		77	57							
FRL	58	57	54	56	66	54	41	59	66			61

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	64	54	47	54	33	25	43	63	47			56
SWD	33	59	69	26	31	20	21					56
ELL	51	49	52	47	35	21	31	48	29			56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26	35		13	18							
HSP	64	53	48	55	33	24	43	62	48			56
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	87	75		70	38		64					
FRL	55	49	48	47	32	26	37	58	42			54

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	72%	56%	16%	54%	18%
07	2023 - Spring	64%	50%	14%	47%	17%
08	2023 - Spring	66%	51%	15%	47%	19%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	58%	18%	58%	18%
06	2023 - Spring	57%	50%	7%	47%	10%
03	2023 - Spring	55%	52%	3%	50%	5%

| MATH | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	90%	58%	32%	54%	36%
07	2023 - Spring	81%	48%	33%	48%	33%
03	2023 - Spring	78%	63%	15%	59%	19%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	64%	17%	61%	20%
08	2023 - Spring	57%	59%	-2%	55%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	70%	58%	12%	55%	15%

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	45%	40%	5%	44%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	56%	50%	6%	51%	5%

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	56%	33%	50%	39%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	68%	20%	66%	22%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school 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 with the lowest performance for the 2022-2023 school year was Science. Some of the contributing factors to last year's low performance are teachers' familiarity with the Science curriculum and testing materials. Although Science scores were the lowest, there was still improvement from the previous school year.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was ELA. The factors that contributed to this were student learning gaps that we have been trying to close since the pandemic. Students' lack of fluency and phonological awareness also contributes to this decline considered that Reading fluency is an important skill to master as it creates a bridge to reading comprehension.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Math. While the state averaged 56% achievement, we averaged 79% achievement. Some of the factors that contributed to this gap were that in the adoption of a new Mathematics curriculum and we hired a Math Coach to help facilitate the transition to the new curriculum.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was our overall scores in Social Studies. In the 2022-2023 school year, we had our dean of discipline mentor, monitor, and model lessons to help guide the Civics teacher. We also provided afterschool tutoring for all Civics students three times a week for 3 months leading up to the exam.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The increasing frequency of student suspensions has raised significant concerns within the school leadership team, prompting discussions about the underlying causes and the potential long-term impacts on both academic progress and student well-being. Addressing the root factors contributing to suspensions and implementing proactive intervention strategies has become a paramount priority for fostering a more inclusive and supportive learning environment.

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

1) Increase proficiency in ELA Statewide Assessment.
2) Increase proficiency in Science Statewide Assessment.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Reducing suspension rates

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Implementing the Leader in Me program in schools has shown promise in reducing suspension rates by fostering students' leadership skills, self-discipline, and conflict resolution abilities. This holistic approach equips students with the tools needed to make positive choices, thereby creating a more harmonious and inclusive school environment that minimizes the need for disciplinary measures. This should reduce our suspensions by 10 %.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Administrators, Dean of Students, and Leader in Me teacher

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alain Suarez (asuarez@matergroveacademy.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The Leader in Me program is a comprehensive and holistic approach to education that empowers students with leadership and life skills, integrating principles of personal responsibility, goal setting, and effective communication into the curriculum. By fostering a culture of proactive problem-solving and collaboration, this program aims to equip students with essential qualities to succeed academically and thrive in various aspects of their lives.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Leader in Me program offers a compelling solution for reducing suspensions in schools by instilling students with essential life skills and social-emotional competencies. By focusing on leadership development, effective communication, and self-regulation, the program equips students with the tools needed to navigate conflicts, make responsible decisions, and contribute positively to their school community. This holistic approach not only addresses the underlying behavioral issues that often lead to suspensions but also fosters a culture of empathy, respect, and collaboration, ultimately creating a more harmonious and inclusive learning environment that minimizes the need for punitive measures.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Training and Professional Development; Curriculum Integration; Recognition and Celebration.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Toledo (toledo@dadeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

To narrow the achievement gap and create an inclusive, supportive, and culturally responsive educational environment for African American students at Mater Grove Academy.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase the overall academic performance and standardized test scores of African American students to be above 41%, aiming to meet or exceed the federal index.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

These programs will be monitored by the school's lead teacher and curriculum coaches.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Toledo (toledo@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The school will implement Dreambox (math) & Lexia (reading) intervention programs. In addition we will provide tutoring and academic counseling, to provide additional support for African American students who may be struggling.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These programs can address specific academic areas where students are lagging behind. Tutors and mentors can identify gaps in knowledge or skills and design activities that directly target those areas, helping students catch up and build a stronger foundation in reading and math.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Training and Professional Development; Curriculum Integration

Person Responsible: Samantha Diaz (sdiaz@matergroveacademy.com)

By When: Quarterly

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

1.Data Collection and Analysis- Allowed us identify trends and needs based off Reading and Math performance levels for the subgroups.

2.Adoption of Lexia (reading) & DreamBox (math) intervention programs that are rated " Strong Evidence" as per ESSA. Professional development will be provided to teachers.

3.Implementation and Monitoring will be completed by our curriculum coaches and vice principal/principal.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				$11,100.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5000	500	5045 - Mater Grove Academy	School Improvement Funds	1226.0	$11,100.00
			Notes: Leader in Me Program			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American				$19,150.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6500	590	5045 - Mater Grove Academy	General Fund	1226.0	$19,150.00
			Notes: $13,800 Lexia $ 5,350 DreamBox			
					Total:	$30,250.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No