
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Merritt Brown Middle School

5044 MERRITT BROWN WAY, Panama City, FL 32404

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Gelonda Martin

Start Date for this Principal: 12/16/2019

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2019-20 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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Merritt Brown Middle School

5044 MERRITT BROWN WAY, Panama City, FL 32404

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	90%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	18%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

Merritt Brown Middle School (MBMS) creates a safe and nurturing environment that inspires student achievement. Our faculty and staff are dedicated to developing well-rounded scholars, life-long learners, and successful leaders of the future through practice and rigorous standards-based curricula.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Merritt Brown Middle School will be a compassionate community in which the character of each individual is exemplified through service.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Martin, Gelonda	Principal	Responsibilities include collaborating with the School Improvement Team, department heads, teachers, and staff to develop and implement the school improvement plan for the purpose of improving student achievement and school climate. Additionally, the principal ensures that school components operate cohesively through the establishment of protocols, processes, and structures, and by providing needed resources.
Treadway, Nina	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Treadway serves as the department head for the English Language Arts (ELA) department. She brings to the forefront ideas from the ELA team.
Simmons, Anna	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Simmons serves as the department head for the math department. She brings to the forefront ideas from the math team.
Hall, Judy	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Hall supports the SIT, teachers and paras to implement SIP goals. She supports Ms. Martin as she ensures the school components operate cohesively.
Wilson, Danyell	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Wilson serves as a school improvement team member representing English Language Arts (ELA) department. She brings to the forefront ideas from the ELA team.
Granberg, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Granberg serves as the department head for the Social Studies department. She brings to the forefront ideas from the social studies team.
Larsen, Jamie	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Larsen serves as a school improvement team member sharing ideas and disseminating data to improve achievement among out Exceptional Student Education cohort.
Westlake, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Westlake serves as a school improvement team member sharing ideas and disseminating behavioral data to improve school climate.
Samples, Kristen	Teacher, Adult	Ms. Samples serves as the department head for the Science department. She brings to the forefront ideas from the science team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 12/16/2019, Gelonda Martin

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2019-20 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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 .	

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	0	209	204	198	0	0	0	0	611
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	23	36	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	61	64	0	0	0	0	159
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	11	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	3	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	32	35	0	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	42	44	0	0	0	0	154

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	57	47	48	0	0	0	0	152

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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	10	0	0	0	0	23

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/8/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	226	207	198	0	0	0	0	631
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	58	54	0	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	65	55	0	0	0	0	169
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	6	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	63	66	0	0	0	0	202

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	48	54	50	0	0	0	0	152

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	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	11	7	0	0	0	0	32

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	226	207	198	0	0	0	0	631
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	58	54	0	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	65	55	0	0	0	0	169
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	6	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	63	66	0	0	0	0	202

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	48	54	50	0	0	0	0	152

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	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	11	7	0	0	0	0	32

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	45%	56%	54%	44%	53%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	59%	54%	51%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	55%	47%	55%	49%	44%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	45%	60%	58%	50%	59%	56%
Math Learning Gains	42%	55%	57%	56%	60%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	55%	51%	57%	59%	50%
Science Achievement	39%	50%	51%	33%	48%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	72%	72%	67%	74%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	46%	56%	-10%	54%	-8%
	2018	44%	51%	-7%	52%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	44%	54%	-10%	52%	-8%
	2018	42%	51%	-9%	51%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	46%	59%	-13%	56%	-10%
	2018	55%	58%	-3%	58%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	38%	53%	-15%	55%	-17%
	2018	45%	52%	-7%	52%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	36%	59%	-23%	54%	-18%
	2018	52%	59%	-7%	54%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
08	2019	46%	48%	-2%	46%	0%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	43%	48%	-5%	45%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	39%	51%	-12%	48%	-9%
	2018	40%	49%	-9%	50%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	72%	74%	-2%	71%	1%
2018	69%	76%	-7%	71%	-2%
Compare		3%			

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	89%	64%	25%	61%	28%
2018	87%	64%	23%	62%	25%
Compare		2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	62%	38%	57%	43%
2018	0%	62%	-62%	56%	-56%
Compare		100%			

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	22	38	39	29	45	48	24	38			
ASN	67	75		73	45						
BLK	25	42		42	42			62			
HSP	52	58		56	42						
MUL	53	56		50	60						
WHT	45	50	45	44	41	54	41	68	41		
FRL	41	48	41	42	40	51	34	67	41		
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	22	38	33	28	43	43	26	46			
ASN	53	41		71	59						
BLK	50	55	64	36	38	46	24				
HSP	42	63		63	46			55			
MUL	63	55		59	37		36		50		
WHT	46	50	39	49	47	55	43	68	45		
FRL	41	50	42	47	46	56	37	64	35		
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	15	41	45	18	40	43	21	40			
ASN	73	55		55	73						
BLK	31	58	73	31	43	53	27	55			
HSP	47	47		47	47						
MUL	52	73	70	67	67		42	79	58		
WHT	43	48	54	50	55	56	32	66	33		
FRL	36	46	53	42	50	54	29	64	30		

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	48
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	429

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	65
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	48
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Since we ended the 2020 school year without a state test to pull data from, we are resubmitting the data we had from the previous year.
 Science Achievement received 41% and Math Learning Gains received a 42%.
 Math Learning Gains was down from 47% in 2019. And, Science was down from 41% in 2018.
 *2019 "ELA Lowest 25th Percentile" score for state/district was 55%, MB's score was lower.
 *2018, MB's "Math Lowest 25th Percentile" performed at 53% whereas state and district performed at 51% and 55% respectively. In 2019, we out scored the state.
 *2018, MB's "Science" score was 41%. The district was 51% and state was 52%. MB scored approximately 10% lower.
 * 2019, MB "Science" score was 39%. The district was 50% and state was 51%. MB scored 11% lower. MB's score dropped from 2018.
 "Science" scores trend is inconsistent: 2016-45%, 2017-33%, 2018-41% and 2019-39%.

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

Since we ended the 2020 school year without a state test to pull data from, we are resubmitting the data we had from the previous year.
 In review of MBMS data from 2019, there were 4 areas that declined from the year before. "Math Achievement" decreased by 5% from 2018, going from 50% to 45%. This was the largest decline in

our reported data. The district and the state also showed decreases of 1% and 0% respectively. The next largest decline was in “Math Learning Gains”, there was a 5% decrease in this component. BDS decreased over all by 6% and the state maintained the same percentage (57%) as the previous year. The last areas that recorded a decline was “Math Lowest Percentile” and “Science Achievement.” For “Math Lowest Percentile,” our numbers dropped by 2% from 55% (2018) to 53% (2019). The district recorded a 3% decline from 58%(2017) to 55%(2019), while the state recorded a consistent average of 51%(2018) and(2019). “Science Achievement” decreased by 2% from 2018, going from 41% to 39%. This component also declined at the district and state level by 1% from 2018.

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.

Since we ended the 2020 school year without a state test to pull data from, we are resubmitting the data we had from the previous year. In reflection of Merritt Brown Middle School’s 2018 data, our findings indicate “Math learning gains” is the constituent with the largest gap at -15%% below average when compared to the state, followed by “Math and Science Achievement” at -13%%.

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

Since we ended the 2020 school year without a state test to pull data from, we are resubmitting the data we had from the previous year. In reviewing Merritt Brown’s data from 2019, one data component showed improvement. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile increased 2% from 2018 going from 41% to 43%. The state level remained the same for this data component, but the district level increased 8%. In the district, ELA Achievement increased 2% and ELA Learning Gains increased 5%.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Since we ended the 2020 school year without a state test to pull data from, we are resubmitting the data we had from the previous year. In looking at the learning gains for the 2018-2019 year, it was not a surprise that there were fewer areas of learning gains during this year. Hurricane Michael drastically affected our school, families, and communities. Students were out of school for over a month and then had limited hours of school for two months. We kept the same percentage of gains for ELA learning gains and Social Studies Achievement and just had small decreases in the other areas. With the learning gains showing up for the lowest 25th percentile is a testament that we were persevering and trying to get the students where they should be. We also provided an intervention class for students who we thought were struggling in different areas. If a teacher noticed a student may have needed extra help, then they were sent to this intervention class temporarily. Then, in 2020 we did not return to brick and mortar school after March, so students did not get as much information at the rushed online learning than they would have in a regular class.

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

1. Lowest 25% in Math
2. Lowest 25% in Reading
3. Discipline referrals down by 25%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Literacy

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The ELA curriculum from the 2019-2020 school year focused more on literacy than informational text. As a result, the students' performance on the ELA MAP revealed a decline in skills related to identifying key ideas and details in nonfiction.

Measurable Outcome: Students will utilize close reading and vocabulary building strategies to increase proficiency in identifying key ideas and details and comprehension of informational text as evidenced by 70% or more meeting or exceeding their projected RIT from the Fall to Winter ELA MAP.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jamie Larsen (larsejj@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Explicit instruction on making and interpreting reading charts, graphs, as well as tables.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: After analyzing ELA MAP 2019-2020 data, it was determined that students were performing lower in key ideas and details and literacy text.

Action Steps to Implement

As a department, teach Greek and Latin Roots to help students with domain-specific vocabulary.

Person Responsible Nina Treadway (treadnp@bay.k12.fl.us)

Assist classroom teachers in diagnosing difficulties via data chats and the creation of prescriptions for those identified students. Lead the integration of data charts/chats to help students interpret graphs and set goals.

Person Responsible Sheri Pender (pendesp@bay.k12.fl.us)

As a department, implement common annotating strategies.

Person Responsible Nina Treadway (treadnp@bay.k12.fl.us)

As a department, implement Just in Time Learning.

Person Responsible Nina Treadway (treadnp@bay.k12.fl.us)

As a department, implement computer-based remediation such as Achieve 3000.

Person Responsible Nina Treadway (treadnp@bay.k12.fl.us)

Hire an ELA interventionist to provide intervention for students who are Tier 2 and Tier 3.

Person Responsible Gelonda Martin (townsgk@bay.k12.fl.us)

Schedule an additional Aspire class for reading.

Person Responsible Judy Hall (hallja@bay.k12.fl.us)

Provide additional support in classrooms via paraprofessionals.

Person Responsible Judy Hall (hallja@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Other specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Due to time constraints, math instruction was not able to adequately cover the material for statistics and probability. As a result, the students' performance on the Math MAP 2019-2020 revealed low mastery skills.

Measurable Outcome: Students will analyze and interpret data while building domain-specific vocabulary to increase proficiency in statistics and probability as evidenced by 70% of students meeting or exceeding their projected RIT score from the fall to winter Math MAP.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Anna Simmons (simmoam@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: As a department, utilize Edmentum to include common mini lessons and assessments that explicitly focus on statistics and probability.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Traditionally, MAP and FSA scores in all grades in statistics and probability are low.

Action Steps to Implement

As a department, implement just in time learning.

Person Responsible Anna Simmons (simmoam@bay.k12.fl.us)

As a department, provide computer-based remediation such as Edmentum and Exact Path

Person Responsible Anna Simmons (simmoam@bay.k12.fl.us)

Hire a math interventionist to provide intervention for students who are Tier 2 and Tier 3. Incorporate an ESE member as a part of the School Improvement Team.

Person Responsible Gelonda Martin (townsgk@bay.k12.fl.us)

Schedule an additional Aspire class for Math.

Person Responsible Judy Hall (hallja@bay.k12.fl.us)

Provide additional support in classrooms via hired paraprofessionals.

Person Responsible Judy Hall (hallja@bay.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Students who are not in class due to suspensions are missing key classroom instruction. The 2019-2020 behavior data revealed that our students have the most write-ups in the areas of inappropriate behavior/language and defiance.

Measurable Outcome: During the 2020-2021 school year, we will reduce the number of discipline referrals in the areas of inappropriate behavior/ language and defiance by 25% as measured by the monthly MTSS behavioral report by implementing a protocol for handling discipline.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Judy Hall (hallja@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The discipline protocol will include use of a Bear Development Lab to provide soft skills intervention and to provide students with the opportunity to reflect and self correct minor infractions prior to receiving a discipline referral.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: During previous years and as noted by the data management system, students were repeat offenders for the same or similar infractions. Ensuring that students have a clear understanding of the school expectations and providing students with the opportunity to self reflect and learn from their mistakes may reduce the number of repeaters.

Action Steps to Implement

The behavioral school improvement team member will monitor behavioral trends and lead the Positive Behavioral Intervention (PBS) Committee using the results of her data analysis.

Person Responsible Shannon Westlake (westlse@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional steps to implement include hiring an additional behavioral paraprofessional, creating and communicating an established protocol for handling disciplinary issues, and creating a process to be followed in the Bear Development Lab.

Person Responsible Gelonda Martin (townsgk@bay.k12.fl.us)

Meet with the School Improvement Team to establish a clear set of school wide behavioral expectations.

Person Responsible Judy Hall (hallja@bay.k12.fl.us)

Hire a liaison to coordinate the school's business partnerships and volunteer and mentorship initiatives.

Person Responsible Gelonda Martin (townsgk@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

History, Science, and Special Areas will incorporate cross-curricular strategies such as close reading, root word vocabulary, word walls, cloze testing, and use of multiple types of graphs for interpretation of statistics in support of Literacy and Math goals.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

MBMS is building a positive school culture and encouraging proximal and broader stakeholder engagement via the following initiatives:

- Hosting a sixth-grade student/parent orientation.
- Establishing a partnership with Girls and Boys Incorporated to provide opportunities for student engagement in 21st century initiatives.
- Working to increase stakeholder involvement on the School Advisory Committee by including teacher and support personnel representation and through the recruitment of interested parents.
- Providing small-group learning for parents via the MBMS parent liaison.
- Engaging parents and students in community-wide events such as the History Fair, Science Fair, award ceremonies, and sports.
- Promoting community awareness via social media (Facebook), PeachJar, Focus, and the District's alert system.
- Clearly communicating the school's mission and vision.
- Hosting parent/teacher conferences to communicate students' progress.
- Providing training on the Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) to faculty and staff.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Literacy	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00