Indiantown Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Indiantown Middle School

16303 SW FARM RD, Indiantown, FL 34956

martinschools.org/o/ims

Demographics

Principal: Jeff Raimann

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (50%) 2014-15: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Indiantown Middle School

16303 SW FARM RD, Indiantown, FL 34956

martinschools.org/o/ims

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	94%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We are committed to empowering, inspiring, and educating all learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

School personnel, parents, students, and community members working in collaboration to ensure success for all learners.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Montessi, Linda	Teacher, ESE	IPS Coach
Raimann, Jeff	Principal	
Gullickson, Siddhi	Instructional Coach	
Bickley, William	Assistant Principal	
Norman, Melora	Assistant Principal	
Daly, Pam	Teacher, K-12	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	142	161	173	165	0	0	0	0	641
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	17	31	30	34	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	1	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	40	58	63	66	0	0	0	0	227
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	17	18	0	0	0	0	53

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

47

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/23/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	33%	62%	54%	35%	62%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	58%	54%	52%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	51%	47%	50%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	61%	74%	58%	53%	71%	56%
Math Learning Gains	64%	68%	57%	54%	72%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	55%	51%	53%	61%	50%
Science Achievement	31%	64%	51%	33%	57%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	95%	87%	72%	48%	75%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	161 (0)	173 (0)	165 (0)	499 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	31 (0)	30 (0)	34 (0)	95 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	7 (0)	1 (0)	9 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (0)	11 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	58 (0)	63 (0)	66 (0)	187 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
06	2019	27%	57%	-30%	54%	-27%
	2018	34%	56%	-22%	52%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	31%	53%	-22%	52%	-21%
	2018	30%	57%	-27%	51%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	37%	62%	-25%	56%	-19%
	2018	36%	63%	-27%	58%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	51%	64%	-13%	55%	-4%
	2018	55%	63%	-8%	52%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	55%	60%	-5%	54%	1%
	2018	32%	65%	-33%	54%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	50%	67%	-17%	46%	4%
	2018	46%	66%	-20%	45%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	30%	58%	-28%	48%	-18%
	2018	30%	57%	-27%	50%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2019						
2018						
CIVICS EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2019	95%	77%	18%	71%	24%	
2018	60%	79%	-19%	71%	-11%	
Compare		35%				
HISTORY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2019						
2018						

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	88%	75%	13%	61%	27%
2018	85%	70%	15%	62%	23%
Compare		3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	65%	30%	57%	38%
2018	100%	61%	39%	56%	44%
Compare		-5%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	38	41	39	60	51	11				
ELL	18	37	41	50	61	52	19		45		
BLK	29	39	33	61	72	65	26				
HSP	32	45	44	60	63	53	30	93	66		
WHT	53	63		69	59		54				
FRL	33	46	44	61	64	56	32	94	73		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	15	35	29	35	51	39	16	46	10		
ELL	20	40	39	49	60	52	17	40	67		
BLK	24	42	37	48	52	42	26	67	80		
HSP	34	43	38	59	61	50	31	61	75		
WHT	42	61		56	71						
FRL	33	44	38	58	61	50	31	64	76		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	11	48	52	34	53	42	11	25			
ELL	17	46	50	42	50	51	17	38	59		
BLK	33	48	45	39	55	53	40	36			
HSP	35	51	50	55	55	55	32	49	75		
WHT	32	65		56	45		33				
FRL	35	52	50	54	53	49	33	48	75		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	545
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

SY19 - Grade 5 ELA Achievement - 30% Proficiency (-13% MCSD Title 1 Elem Schools Avg)
SY19 - Grade 6 ELA Achievement - 34% Proficiency(-12% MCSD Title 1 Middle Schools Avg)
Current Grade 6 ELA - Cohort Proficiency (SY19 Gr 5) decreased from 4th grade to 5th grade, 10% points;
Percentage of Students Making Learning Gains decreased 14% points; Percentage of L25 Students Making Learning Gains decreased 23% points
*Disconnect between Elementary to MS (balanced-literacy); Barriers to providing proper reading interventions

SY19 - Grade 5 Science Achievement: 27% Proficiency (-17% MCSD Title 1 Elem Schools Avg)

SY19 - Grade 8 Science Achievement: 32% Proficiency (-16% MCSD Title 1 Middle Schools Avg)

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

ELL Achievement - ELA Grade 6, 29% decrease in LGs
ESE Achievement - Math Grade 6, 40% decrease in LGs

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.

Grade 5 ELA, -28%
Grade 5 Science, -28%

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

Civics overall performance increased (32% points) from 17-18 63%) to 18-19 (95%); however, IMS tested 129 students in 17-18 and only 21 in 18-19.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Two areas of concern include:
1. Ending the decline in attendance rate over a 5-year span, which can impact student achievement outcomes.
2. Attempting to reduce the number of students at a L1 in ELA, while increasing proficiency rates and learning gains.

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

1. Increase the Percentage of Proficient Students in ELA
2. Increase the Percentage of Students Making ELA Learning Gains
3. Increase the Percentage of Lowest Quartile Students Making ELA Learning Gains
4. Increase ESE Achievement in ELA & Math
5. Increase ELL Achievement in ELA & Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase ELA Achievement and Learning Gains
Rationale	Overall proficiency from SY18 to SY19 remained at 34% (grades 6-8); 33% (grades 5-8) MCSD Title 1 Middle Schools Avg. ELA Achievement 45% (-12%) Cohort Data: Proficiency decreased from 4th grade to 5th grade, 10% points Proficiency increased from 5th grade to 6th grade, 2% points Proficiency decreased from 6th grade to 7th grade, 2% points Proficiency increased from 7th grade to 8th grade, 9% points Increase in learning gains (2%) from SY18 (44%) to SY19 (46%) MCSD Title 1 Middle Schools Avg. ELA LGs 50% (-2%) Cohort Data: LG decreased from 4th grade to 5th grade, 14% points LG increased from 5th grade to 6th grade, 8% points LG decreased from 6th grade to 7th grade, 3% points Increase in LG of L25 (6%) from SY18 (38%) to SY19 (44%) MCSD Title 1 Middle Schools Avg. ELA L25 LGs 47% (-3%) Cohort Data: L25 LGs decreased from 4th grade to 5th grade, 23% points
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	SY20: ELA Achievement 46% ELA Learning Gains 51% ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains 48%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jeff Raimann (raimanj@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure standards-based instruction with clearly aligned learning target and well-defined success criteria Move toward a more balanced literacy approach integrating various modalities of literacy instruction, including a renewed focused on independent & guided reading Reading-specific MTSS Offer additional Reading course (beyond Intensive Reading) to students who scored Level 2 on SY19 ELA FSA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The goal of standards-based instruction is to provide each student an opportunity to produce evidence of proficiency of grade-level standards. The bulk of this work occurs in planning, including unpacking the grade-level content standard into smaller chunks and designing a task that requires students produce evidence at the complexity level of the standard. Research has firmly established the correlation between time spent reading and reading

achievement. This includes increased engagement and motivation, improved comprehension and vocabulary, increased fluency, and development of background knowledge.

MTSS emphasizes multiple levels of instruction and support for all learners.

Action Step	
Description	1. Hire Hybrid Reading Teacher/Instructional Coach and develop curriculum for new Reading course. 2. Full Day PD and follow-up coaching days provided to instructional staff by Learning Sciences International (LSI) on Target-Task Alignment 3. Daily Classroom Walk-Through's to ensure fidelity of all phases of Target/Task alignment through data collection, analysis of trends, communication with instructional staff, and targeted support. 4.. District Literacy Coach to work with grade-5 ELA teachers on effectively implementing Balanced Literacy (Planning, Modeling, Reflecting, Coaching); guided reading (5-6) 5. Common ELA block created for grades 6-8 to include 20 minutes of independent reading (stamina/fluency/active reading building) and response journaling to a specific reading strategy taught in which actionable feedback will be provided to support individual student growth. During the 20 minute block, teachers will confer with readers/individual students (3000 new books purchased for teachers to build independent reading classroom libraries). 6. Refine MTSS model w/targeted academic interventions & tracking (reading focus)
Person Responsible	William Bickley (bicklew@martin.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Increase Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities
	This subgroup has been designated for targeted support and intervention under ESSA.
Rationale	ELA Achievement SWD 16% ELA Learning Gains SWD 38% ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains 41%

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	SY20: ELA Achievement SWD 21% ELA Learning Gains SWD 43% ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains 46%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jeff Raimann (raimanj@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	S.P.I.R.E. Phonics Instruction for ESE students that need intensive support (full-time ESE teacher) Classroom Walkthroughs with targeted "look-fors" to improve identification of best practices for supporting SWDs and effective collaboration between Support Facilitators and classroom teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	S.P.I.R.E.® is a research-proven reading intervention program. It is designed to build reading success through an intensive, structured, and spiraling curriculum that incorporates phonological awareness, phonics, spelling, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension in a systematic 10-Step lesson plan. CWTs are a tool for identifying data trends and driving continuous improvement.

Action Step	
Description	1. Hire full-time S.P.I.R.E-trained ESE teacher. 2. Identify and enroll qualifying students. 3. Verify learning by tracking student growth. 1. Develop targeted "look-fors." 2. Publish targeted-CWT schedule for Administration, Campus Instructional Leaders, ESE Specialist and Support Facilitators. 3. Track data trends and communicate with stakeholders. 4. Meet regularly with ESE department to build collective efficacy and problem solve.
Person Responsible	Melora Norman (normanm@martin.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Increase Learning Gains for English Language Learners
Rationale	ELL ELA Achievement 18% ELL ELA Learning Gains 37% ELL ELA Learning Gains Lowest Quartile 41%

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELL ELA Achievement 23% ELL ELA Learning Gains 42% ELL ELA Learning Gains Lowest Quartile 46%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jeff Raimann (raimanj@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilize Imaging Learning with fidelity and monitor reports to support language acquisition District ELL coaching support and training (2x monthly) to embed language acquisition support strategies within instructional practices and content area. Interactive notebooks will be utilized during small group instruction in intensive reading classes. This work will focus on: Explicit and progressive phonics instruction Print Concept/phonemic awareness Word study Reading strategies ELA teachers will work with district literacy coach to implement guiding reading groups to support English language learners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Imagine Learning program has been studied and statistically significant positive effect has been found for English language learners shown in Journal of Research and Reading study. Interactive notebooks are ideally suited to the needs of English learners as a place to record learning, develop proficiency, and actively engage and take ownership for learning. Guided reading is an important component of a balanced literacy program. The same effective strategies used with native English speakers are used with ELLs; however, scaffolds must be added for support. Research-based supports include carefully selected text, building background knowledge, frontloading new vocabulary, and allowing ELL students frequent opportunities to respond to text.

Action Step	
Description	1. Communicate expectations for monitoring and verifying learning of ELL students utilizing Imagine Learning program. 2. Offer training as needed to support teachers and ELL paraprofessionals in using Imagine Learning with students. 3. Develop interactive notebooks for ELL students in Intensive Reading courses and collaborate within Collaborative Learning Teams to verify student learning and plan further instruction.

4. Focus on planning for guided reading during Collaborative Learning Team meetings and analysis of student learning evidence.
5. Develop ELL coaching support calendar of staff training and coaching support.

Person Responsible William Bickley (bicklew@martin.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

Each grade-level will hold a "Family Engagement Night" to build positive relationships within our school community. In addition to building these essential relationships, teachers will empower, inspire, and educate parents by sharing resources to support a school-home connection.

PFEP Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Collaboration occurs as students transition from Warfield Elementary, our only feeder school as well as, to South Fork High School.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Title I, Part A
IMS coordinates with the Martin County District office on all matters involving Title I. This involves both formal, scheduled meetings and informal day-to-day contacts to insure the smooth coordination of all efforts. Both budgetary and programmatic issues are fully coordinated. Where others are needed (i.e., ESE, food services, etc.) they are contacted directly and invited to participate in meetings.

Title I, Part C- Migrant
IMS has conducted a Comprehensive Needs Assessment for all students. In addition to looking at academic needs for student, this needs assessment considers staff development and addresses the priorities established for Title III, Migrant and Title I programs. IMS continues to work closely with the Parent Resource Center to provide as much support to our Migrant Program.

Title I, Part D
The priorities established for Title I Part D are addressed in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment.

Title II
Professional Development strategies outlined in the School Improvement Plan are tied to funds provided by Title II.

Title III
The Comprehensive Needs Assessment considers student academic needs as well as staff development data that address the priorities established for Title III.

Title X- Homeless
Homeless students and their families are offered support through the guidance department, school nurse and other school personnel. Brochures about services for the homeless are available in the front office.

Violence Prevention Programs
IMS uses the Drug Abuse Resistance Education Program (DARE) in grade 5. The guidance counselor and other staff provide interventions and assistance as requested. In addition, IMS will continue to communicate with the district's Certified Prevention Specialist and attempt to bring in guest speakers throughout the year.

Nutrition Programs
IMS has established provisions so that every student is eligible for free breakfast and lunch. The cafeteria manager maintains a bulletin board in the cafeteria, detailing nutritional information.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

As a part of the middle school journey, we have added a "Career Planning" component to the required 8th Grade US History course. The teacher leads every student through the "Bridges" on-line career planning assessment. Students are able to identify careers that align with their interests and then discover the pathways needed to reach their goals. The students find this to be beneficial as they register for high school courses and truly begin to plan for their future, making the connections to the coursework and the careers.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

IMS will partner with local businesses, industry, and community organizations to advance college and career awareness while supporting academics within our classrooms. Community members will present about their college experience and beyond, chosen career field, or integrate their expertise within our classrooms through project-based learning.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase ELA Achievement and Learning Gains			$80,285.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

			0221 - Indiantown Middle School	Title, I Part A		$45,000.00
			Notes: We have added an Intervention Teacher/Coaching position, in which the teacher will be able to target specific students that are in need of additional intervention throughout the day in ELA. In addition, this teacher will also serve in a coaching capacity, supporting fellow teachers with lesson planning, modeling instructional strategies and provide professional supports for the various needs of our students.			
			0221 - Indiantown Middle School	Title, I Part A		$10,000.00
			Notes: We have been able to provide educational supplies aimed at enhancing teaching and learning. This will include creating classroom libraries for all ELA classroom teachers, as independent reading libraries have an enormous impact on literacy development and in encouraging students to become avid readers.			
			0221 - Indiantown Middle School	Title, I Part A		$11,385.00
			Notes: The Fountas & Pinnell Classroom™ Guided Reading Collection purchased for Grades 5-6. These resources will enable our ELA teachers to meet students where they are as readers and lead them forward with intention and precision. y bringing together a small group of children who are at a similar point in their reading development and guiding them to process a test that is leveled on a gradient of difficulty, teachers will be able to provide an incremental amount of challenge at each reader's edge of ability to process text.			
			0221 - Indiantown Middle School	Title, I Part A		$9,900.00
			Notes: Learning Sciences International provided instructional staff training on Target-Task Alignment and Teaming approach, as well as a follow-up coaching and implementation day for administration and instructional coaches. Staff learned how to plan tasks that allow students to demonstrate progress toward a standard using Learning Targets, while the teacher steps back from a direct instruction role to focus more time on monitoring and supporting students as they work. Academic teaming is a daily instructional process where students collaborate, peer coach, and peer teach while engaged in rigorous, standards-based tasks.			
			0221 - Indiantown Middle School			$4,000.00
			Notes: Literacy Colleagues Inc. will provide professional development to all Grade 5 and Grade 6 ELA teachers on small-group guided reading and strategy lessons. Follow-up will support will be provided for planning within Collaborative Learning Teams and implementation through a coaching-cycle with each (5) ELA teacher.			
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Increase Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities**				$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Increase Learning Gains for English Language Learners**				$0.00
					Total:	**$80,285.00**