

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Mater Lakes Collegiate Academy High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Mater Lakes Collegiate Academy High School

8851 NW 170TH STREET, Miami, FL 33143

[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.

Mater Lakes Collegiate Academy High School, with immeasurable expectations for success in the classroom, in the community, and for the future, partner with teachers, administrators and staff, to create a challenging curriculum, moral values, loyalty and teamwork for a community of learners who are the successful leaders of tomorrow and epitomize the characteristics of truth, honor, and change.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Mater Lakes Collegiate Academy will be a campus where students learn from teachers who are passionate about their subjects and consider it a privilege to pass knowledge to the minds of our students.

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
Enriquez, Marjorie	Assistant Principal	School operations
Aleman, Zahilys	Administrative Support	Curriculum Specialist
Martinez, Alice	Principal	School operations 5057
Bobea, Patricia	School Counselor	Counseling
Burgos, Steven	Administrative Support	AP Coordinator/Certification
Gil, Melissa	Administrative Support	Scheduling and discipline
Gonzalez, Adriana	Teacher, ESE	ESE /IEP/504
Mansfield , Johanna	Teacher, Career/Technical	Early Childhood and Certification
Paez, Jennifer	Science Coach	Technology and VILS
Rodriguez, Barbara	Reading Coach	ELL and Reading
Rodriguez, Margie	School Counselor	Counseling and scheduling
Rovirosa, Rene	Principal	5052 Principal duties and Operations
Sotolongo, L.	Math Coach	Math and Testing

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.

Stake Holder involvement will be considered as our school leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents, students and families, as well as business or community leaders will provide their input via ESAC meetings, department meetings and faculty meetings as well as school orientation and zoom meetings. Their input will be used in the SIP development process to identify student achievement needs and strategies to improve them.

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 School Improvement Plan 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 by reporting all pertinent information via EESAC meetings and faculty meetings.

The school designated SIP coordinator will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement and share information with the leadership team, stakeholders, and other pertinent members of the academic community.

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	98%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	29%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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)	
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	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	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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
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	0	
One or more suspensions	0	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	0	
Course failure in Math	0	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	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	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	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*	46	55	50		54	51			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	36	43	38		42	38			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	45	62	64		41	40			
Social Studies Achievement*		69	66		56	48			
Middle School Acceleration					56	44			
Graduation Rate		89	89		56	61			
College and Career Acceleration		70	65		67	67			
ELP Progress		49	45						

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	127
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
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				
ELL	18	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	41			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	35	Yes	1	

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

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	46			36			45					
SWD												
ELL	12			24							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	44			35			43				3	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	47			23							2	

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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
10	2023 - Spring	38%	54%	-16%	50%	-12%
09	2023 - Spring	42%	51%	-9%	48%	-6%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	28%	56%	-28%	50%	-22%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	49%	52%	-3%	48%	1%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	43%	65%	-22%	63%	-20%

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.

T Mater Collegiate High, the data component with the lowest performance is Reading with a passing score of 61% and Mathematics with percentages ranging from 48% to 54% including overall performance. Contributing factors include increased numbers of ELL and select SWD individuals with special needs and those who lack rigorous curriculum and exposure.

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

NA

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.

Data not available

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

Algebra showed the most improvement with 100% passing rate.

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

Data not available

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

Areas for improvement for the 23-24 school year will include:

1. Reading and Writing efforts to improve student achievement
2. Added resources and assistance for ELL population and parent contact/involvement
3. Increased resources and tutoring in Math and Reading
4. Increase attendance and involvement of parents and stakeholders
5. Increased resources for the lowest 25% in Math and Reading

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 Other**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.

Mater Lakes Collegiate will attempt to increase school culture and environment by increasing parent and stakeholder involvement. By June 1st, 2024, the number of participants in the EESAC committee and or meetings will increase by 5% as indicated by attendance to meetings and participation throughout the school year to improve culture and foster positive environment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The measurable outcome will depend, in part, on data based objective outcomes for the increase of attendance and participation in EESAC will be 5% as evidenced in attendance rosters and school participation activity logs/parent hours.

Monitoring:

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

The monitoring process for this focus area will be as follows: This area of focus will be monitored via parent hour logs, attendance rosters and school activity and participation logs. Conclusively, the administrative team will monitor data results monthly to support to parents, students and other stakeholders who are involved in the progress and provide additional support, resources, and possible resources for further involvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Zahilys Aleman (943595@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 evidence-based intervention being implemented for this area of focus will include the involvement of cafeteria staff and marketing department to effectively advertise events and increase participation. Additionally, parent trainings and other efforts offered by the counseling department will also support this intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Marketing and and parent training interventions will increase needed support at home and at the school level so that a positive culture and environment are created and sustain throughout the school year fostering presence and academic involvement.

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.

1. Create marketing material for EESAC meetings
2. Send CONNECT ED. to parents
3. Take attendance at all meetings
4. Offer Parent-Training sessions as needed
5. Contact Counselors for assistance

Person Responsible: Zahilys Aleman (943595@dadeschools.net)

By When: This will take place by June 1st, 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

Our area of focus will be Math as evidenced by the following performing subgroups:

Overall math achievement is 38%

Algebra achievement is 27%

Geometry Achievement is 48%

Mater Collegiate expects to provide assistance and professional development so teachers will acquire in-depth knowledge of their subject area of Mathematics, Geometry and Algebra and the process in order for them to be able to guide and aid students in making progress towards standards mastery in Math.

Students will be held accountable for their progress as they are a crucial component in increasing their proficiency levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome goal we wish to achieve is an increase of 8% in math overall for the 23-24 school year. In order for teachers and students to meet the intended outcomes, Mater Lakes students will be exposed to and taught strategies that will provide additional enrichment especially to those working below grade-level or having difficulties on specific grade-level benchmarks in math. Students will benefit from differentiated instruction, small group setting, and push-in and pull-out tutoring where their specific needs can be met. For the math portion of this goal, we expect scores to increase by 8%% . With these increases, we will meet the state and district standard.

Monitoring:

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

The math coach and chairs will provide the following support for monitoring the desired outcome:

1. Teacher performance observations
2. Data Chats
3. Teacher training via professional development

In addition to these areas of focus, we will include quarterly assessment, diagnostic assessments from iReady math and teacher created baselines, will indicate student progress throughout the school year. In essence, this will provide critical insight as to the enhancement of instruction. Additionally, classroom and teacher assessments as well as some online monitoring of individual as well as cooperative learning will be utilized to monitor progress. Tutoring sessions will also serve as monitoring tools that will define the individual plans of action for learners.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

L. Sotolongo (Isotolongo@materlakes.org)

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 evidence based intervention provided for this focus area will include:

1. Differentiated instruction in Math courses targeting the lowest 25%
2. Area focused professional development for teachers on a need-only basis
3. Online resources such as MathXI for students to increase learning and improve scores
4. Kahn Academy and SAT style resources also provided as early intervention

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting these strategies includes increased results in consecutive and efficient use of materials and resources by teachers and support personnel as evidenced by class work and assessment scores as well as student performance. Furthermore, research shows evidence-based teaching strategies/interventions have the largest impact on student results. In an effort to monitor the effectiveness of the action plan, quarterly assessment, diagnostic assessments from iReady math and reading, and baselines, will indicate student progress throughout the school year. In essence, this will provide critical insight as to the enhancement of instruction. Also, teachers will provide input at grade-level department meetings to review notes with team leaders for the purposes of targeting students that continue to struggle with grade-level text. Conclusively, the administrative team will monitor data results monthly to support teachers with students who are not making adequate progress and provide additional support, resources, and possible parental involvement.

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.

1. Identify learners who did not meet math proficiency
2. Identify teachers who will receive and offer training and support
3. Provide online support (Kahn Academy/Math XL) practice for select students
4. Offer/promote participation in Math professional development
5. Interact with students and review individual data
6. Monitor classroom teacher via observations and assessment data

Person Responsible: L. Sotolongo (lsotolongo@materlakes.org)

By When: This will be accomplished by June 1st, 2024.

#3. 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.

Mater Lakes Collegiate will focus on reading/ELA and ELA lowest 25%/ELL. The Utilization of data at the classroom level is imperative to increasing student achievement as it is ever changing. Teachers will acquire in-depth knowledge via professional development of the process in order for them to be able to guide and aid students in making progress towards BEST standards mastery. Students need to be made aware of areas for growth, and held accountable for their progress as they are a crucial component to increasing their proficiency level. The focus will expand to mostly reading as passing scores are 61% for grades 9th and 10th.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school's intended outcome is to meet the needs of Mater Lakes Collegiate students by utilizing the BEST Standards and strategies that will serve the purpose of providing additional enrichment to students working below grade-level or having difficulties on specific grade-level benchmarks in Reading. Students will benefit from being in a small group setting where their specific needs can be met. We expect learning scores in ELA to increase to at least 65% in reading.

Monitoring:

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

Mater Collegiate expects teachers, tutors and department chairs will provide input at grade-level department meetings to review notes with team leaders for the purposes of targeting students that continue to struggle with grade-level text. Finally, the administrative team will monitor the data results on a monthly basis to support teachers with students who are not making adequate progress. Finally, the ESOL department chair will meet with teachers on a quarterly basis to discuss strategies and growth of the lowest 25% in ELA and ESOL in order to increase learner achievement in reading and ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Barbara Rodriguez (barodriguez@materlakes.org)

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 intervention strategies that will be employed by Mater Lakes Collegiate Academy to improve the academic performance in the area of reading/ELA for our bottom 25% category will consist of our push-in/pullout tutoring sessions, research based/computer based learning programs (iReady/MHM/Noredink.com), as well as applying differentiated Instruction in all classrooms (Monitored by Curriculum Instructors). Furthermore, administrators and teachers alike will be provided increased professional development opportunities through workshops, PLCs, lesson studies, and other technology based programs to acquire effective techniques to incorporate during all reading content areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for intervention will include research-based strategies/intervention such as differentiated instruction and computer-based learning programs, have proven to be effective tools in the enhancement of student learning. Moreover, research shows that evidence-based teaching strategies and professional development in select areas are likely to have the largest impact on student results. Therefore, in an effort to monitor the effectiveness of the action plan, quarterly assessment, diagnostic assessments from iReady reading, mid-year baselines, will indicate student progress throughout the school year. In essence, this will

provide useful insight as to the enhancement of instruction. Also, teachers will provide input at grade-level department meetings to review notes with team leaders for the purposes of targeting students that continue to struggle with grade-level text. Finally, the administrative team will monitor the data results on a monthly basis to support teachers with students who are not making adequate progress.

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.

1. Identify Struggling learners in ELA and ELL as well as Lowest 25%
2. Provide Push-in and Pull-out tutoring
3. Monitor data and progress monitoring results via data assessments
4. Infuse classroom opportunities for differentiated instruction
5. Increase Leadership team reviews and observations
6. Increase PD and workshop opportunities

Person Responsible: Barbara Rodriguez (barodriguez@materlakes.org)

By When: June 1st, 2024

1. Identify Struggling learners in ELA and ELL as well as Lowest 25%
2. Provide Push-in and Pull-out tutoring
3. Monitor data and progress monitoring results via data assessments
4. Infuse classroom opportunities for differentiated instruction
5. Increase Leadership team reviews and observations
6. Increase PD and workshop opportunities

Person Responsible: Barbara Rodriguez (barodriguez@materlakes.org)

By When: June 1st, 2024

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 school leadership team will review the school improvement funding allocations, meetings and strategy sessions will take place with the leadership team, the SIP coordinator, select stakeholders, and the Title I representative to ensure proper funding and interventions/resources are allocated effectively. All activities and interventions shall be approved and funded accordingly with the goal of increasing student learning and performance in math and reading, as well as school culture and environment.