

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Mater International Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	20
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Mater International Academy

3405 NW 27TH AVE, Miami, FL 33142

www.materinternational.com

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.

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, 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
Camarena, Olga	Principal	<p>Principal will meet with the school leadership team on a monthly 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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
Gomez, Paul	Instructional Coach	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Master Schedules -Member of Threat Assessment Team -Test Chair

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.

Stakeholders are involved in the process of the process of the School Improvement Plan development through the participation in the EESAC meetings. This includes parents, students and teachers. Additionally, parents are invited to monthly parent academies to communicate their input for the SIP development.

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 SIP will be monitored by the administration team on a quarterly basis. The leadership team will take into account data provided by ongoing progress monitoring assessments such as the FAST and i-Ready Diagnostics. If needed, the school will revise the plan to ensure students are making adequate progress.

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)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	100%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	95%
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) Hispanic Students (HSP)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C
	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	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	6	6	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	20	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	4	8	1	2	0	0	0	0	15	
Course failure in Math	0	4	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	14	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	24	36	15	5	9	0	0	0	0	89	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	24	35	18	4	10	0	0	0	0	91	
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	25	35	18	4	9	0	0	0	0	91	

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	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	1	7	3	3	3	0	0	0	17	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	1	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	7	8	0	0	0	36	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	11	14	0	0	0	44	
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	3	19	8	15	22	0	0	0	67

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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 days	0	1	7	3	3	3	0	0	0	17	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	1	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	7	8	0	0	0	36	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	11	14	0	0	0	44	
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	3	19	8	15	22	0	0	0	67

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
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*	41	60	53	45	62	56	35		
ELA Learning Gains				68			34		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63					
Math Achievement*	50	66	59	33	58	50	31		
Math Learning Gains				50			19		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69					
Science Achievement*	65	58	54	29	64	59	20		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	69	63	59	60			55		

* 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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	265
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	37	Yes	2	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	53			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

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	53			

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	22	Yes	1	1
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	52			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	52			

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	41			50			65					69
SWD	0			29							3	82
ELL	38			44			69				5	69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	40			49			65				5	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												
FRL	41			50			66				5	70

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	45	68	63	33	50	69	29					60
SWD	0			15								50
ELL	38	70	64	36	58		19					60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	45	69	63	34	50	67	29					60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	43	68	63	33	50	69	26					60

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	35	34		31	19		20					55
SWD												
ELL	34	22		34	22		19					55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	36	33		33	20		21					55
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	35	34		31	19		20					55

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	36%	56%	-20%	54%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	42%	58%	-16%	58%	-16%
03	2023 - Spring	43%	52%	-9%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	54%	63%	-9%	59%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	64%	-2%	61%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	39%	58%	-19%	55%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	61%	50%	11%	51%	10%

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 which showed the lowest performance was ELA Achievement. One contributing factor for this area of improvement is the significant learning gaps in reading with our third through Fifth grade students. Another factor is the language challenge and barriers within our English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities subgroups.

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

The data component which showed the greatest decline from the previous school years was ELA achievement. ELA achievement in 2022 was 45% and dropped to 43%. Factors which attributed to the decline include low academic performance in vocabulary and comprehension in literature.

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.

According to the data our third through fifth grade ELA data at 43% had the greatest gap when compared to the state average at 54%. More specifically, our data was lower than the state average by 11%. Factors that contributed to this gap is the language barrier among our ELL population.

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

Our math component increased from 33% to 55% in grades 3-5, showing the most improvement. Our school implemented explicit instruction in mathematics, which a focus on acceleration in mathematics, which helped to improve our proficiency.

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

One potential area of concern is the number of third grade students who were retained in the 2022-2023 school year because of significant learning gaps.

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

Our school's priority in the upcoming year is to close student gaps in reading comprehension among our third through fifth graders.

Our second priority is to increase ELA achievement levels among our fifth grade students.

Our third priority is to increase achievement among our Students with Disabilities subgroup.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 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.

Instructional Practice relating to ELA is an Area of Focus due to the gap between school data and the state achievement data. Additionally, low ELA achievement directly correlates to low science achievement in fifth grade.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Mater International Academy plans to improve student performance in the area of informational text, vocabulary and comprehension using at or above grade level material. We plan to implement a variety of ELA strategies that will help students accurately determine the central idea of the given text.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will have monthly data chats to analyze ongoing data with third through fifth grade teachers to ensure that student progress is being achieved in ELA. This includes ongoing progress monitoring data from FAST and i-Ready Diagnostics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paul Gomez (947872@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.)

Small group instructions, Wonders Bi-Weeklies, I-Ready, Implementation Guide for ELA. 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 Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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. standards throughout content areas will provide students with additional opportunities to master standards and academic vocabulary.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. 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.

This subgroup Students with Disabilities was 8% proficiency in ELA making it a crucial need in our school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school plans to improve SWD by increasing proficiency to 15%.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will monitor this subgroup performance on assessments throughout the year to ensure gains and closing gaps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paul Gomez (947872@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 leadership team will continue providing students with accommodations as needed. They will also use i-Ready to close instructional gaps and help differentiate instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

I-Ready is an evidence based intervention that helps students at their individual needs.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**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.

The subgroup Students with Disabilities was 8% proficient in ELA making it a crucial need in our school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school plans to improve the subgroup, SWD, by increasing proficiency to 15%.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will monitor the subgroup's performance on assessments throughout the year to ensure they are making gains and closing gaps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paul Gomez (947872@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 SPED team, including teachers will continue providing the students with accommodations as necessary. Additionally, the subgroup students will use i-Ready to close instructional gaps and help differentiate instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

i-Ready is an evidence based intervention that helps students at their individual needs.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

The leadership team will meet to ensure that resources and funding is allocated based on the needs of our students. The team will present the information to the EESAC meeting as well to include all stakeholders.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Mater International Academy will disseminate the SIP at the Title I Parent Annual Meeting. Additionally, the SIP will be presented at the EESAC meeting for all stakeholders to receive. The presentation will be in both English and Spanish so that all parents can understand.

www.materinternationalacademy.com

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school plans to hold quarterly parent meetings to build positive relationships with families. These meetings will help support the needs of students and families.

www.materinternationalacademy.com

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The school plans to implement explicit instruction, differentiated instruction and interventions as needed based on ongoing progress monitoring data.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A