

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Martinez Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Martinez Middle School

5601 W LUTZ LAKE FERN RD, Lutz, FL 33558

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Toby Johnson

Start Date for this Principal: 11/5/2019

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	22%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (77%) 2017-18: A (80%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (76%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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 Hillsborough 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	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Martinez Middle School

5601 W LUTZ LAKE FERN RD, Lutz, FL 33558

[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	No	21%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

The faculty, staff, and community of Martinez Middle School will provide a safe and nurturing environment that encourages students to reach their maximum potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bob Martinez Middle School will foster an environment where all students thrive academically, socially, and emotionally through the collective efficacy of community stakeholders, school personnel, and students.

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
Costanzo, Layla	School Counselor	Student Support, Academic Progress Monitoring, Student Scheduling
Johnson, Toby	Principal	School Leader, Campus Safety, Instructional Leader, Supervision, Community Liaison, Staff Management and Development
Choate, Lonnie	Assistant Principal	Student Discipline, Facilities, Supervision, Community Liaison, Staff Management and Development

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 11/5/2019, Toby Johnson

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.*

7

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.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

65

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	22%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (77%) 2017-18: A (80%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (76%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	377	386	437	0	0	0	0	1200	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	20	32	0	0	0	0	68	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	39	35	0	0	0	0	88	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	15	19	0	0	0	0	48	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	19	19	0	0	0	0	60	

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	1	0	0	0	1	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	385	429	415	0	0	0	0	1229	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	15	18	0	0	0	0	44	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	14	0	0	0	0	27	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	34	40	0	0	0	0	107	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	15	26	0	0	0	0	74	

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	16	14	22	0	0	0	0	52

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	

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	385	429	415	0	0	0	0	1229
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	15	18	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	14	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	34	40	0	0	0	0	107
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	15	26	0	0	0	0	74

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	16	14	22	0	0	0	0	52

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	

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	82%	51%	54%	82%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	52%	54%	70%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	47%	47%	65%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	88%	55%	58%	86%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	75%	57%	57%	75%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	52%	51%	67%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	79%	47%	51%	75%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	93%	67%	72%	90%	66%	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	83%	53%	30%	54%	29%
	2018	85%	52%	33%	52%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	80%	54%	26%	52%	28%
	2018	79%	52%	27%	51%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2019	82%	53%	29%	56%	26%
	2018	87%	54%	33%	58%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	84%	49%	35%	55%	29%
	2018	86%	48%	38%	52%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	89%	62%	27%	54%	35%
	2018	88%	61%	27%	54%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	68%	31%	37%	46%	22%
	2018	51%	29%	22%	45%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	78%	47%	31%	48%	30%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	80%	48%	32%	50%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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	91%	67%	24%	71%	20%
2018	87%	65%	22%	71%	16%
Compare		4%			
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	93%	63%	30%	61%	32%
2018	97%	63%	34%	62%	35%
Compare		-4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%
2018	97%	56%	41%	56%	41%
Compare		3%			

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	48	54	53	49	56	48	45	62	68		
ELL	50	57	56	57	68	56		88			

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
ASN	94	82		97	86		96	100	97		
BLK	77	68		83	75	50		100			
HSP	80	68	59	83	72	71	78	86	83		
MUL	79	61	58	83	76	40	73	100	86		
WHT	82	66	58	89	75	66	79	93	86		
FRL	72	63	54	79	65	60	73	87	83		
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	43	60	56	47	67	62	32	55	64		
ELL	56	70	64	63	70	67	50				
ASN	95	87		100	100		89	93	93		
BLK	71	53	62	70	66	59	33				
HSP	80	73	68	81	79	68	76	84	86		
MUL	88	68	60	90	86	80	94	62	90		
WHT	84	69	64	90	83	81	83	89	87		
FRL	70	63	55	75	78	70	63	82	86		
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	33	54	46	38	54	48	19	57			
ELL	36	52	52	52	70	68					
ASN	93	79		96	86	82	100	100	94		
BLK	62	74	65	65	69	67	62	64	83		
HSP	74	68	59	83	75	71	67	84	95		
MUL	84	65		84	75	55	86	94	87		
WHT	85	70	67	87	73	65	76	92	93		
FRL	66	63	53	73	69	62	51	72	83		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	86
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	781
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	65
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	93
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	76
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	76
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	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	77
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	71
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.

ELA lowest 25th percentile performed the lowest at 59%

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

Math lowest 25th percentile showed the greatest decline by 11 points

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.

Our school produced higher achievement scores than the state average in each data component.

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

Social Studies achievement showed the most improvement by 5 points. A new computer-based program called USA Test Prep was utilized during Civics EOC Boot Camp.

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

ELA lowest 25th percentile and Math lowest 25th percentile

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

1. Increase learning gains in ELA lowest 25th percentile
2. Increase learning gains in Math lowest 25th percentile
3. Increase Math learning gains
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Increasing student engagement through scaffolding and collaborative structures.

Measurable Outcome: Students will participate in engaging collaborative lessons that have been created using a scaffolding method.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will participate in the Academic Moves professional development training to learn about the 15 skills students need to succeed. Teachers will utilize these strategies in their classroom lesson planning and instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This professional development training will provide teachers with the necessary tools to incorporate reading, writing, and discussion strategies in their classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will attend the Academic Moves Professional Development Training

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Teachers will implement reading, writing, and discussion in their lesson planning

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Administration will conduct walkthrough observations to look for reading, writing, and discussion during classroom lessons

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Presenting students curriculum in different forms will further understanding

Measurable Outcome: For the 2020-2021 school year, 61% of the students in our lowest 25th percentile will make ELA gains

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiated instruction, student engagement, No Red Ink, Read Theory, standards-based grading, SWAG (small group instruction), ELP, small group rotation model. Development, administration, and analysis of common formative assessments

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Professional development, PLC data analysis, PSLT meetings, faculty meetings

Action Steps to Implement

Differentiated Instruction

Person Responsible Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

No Red Ink

Person Responsible Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

SWAG (Small Group Instruction)

Person Responsible Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

Read Theory

Person Responsible Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

ELP

Person Responsible Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math gains- RTI/MTSS process will be integrated into the classroom to identify and assist students in need.

Measurable Outcome: For the 2020-2021 school year, 68% of the students in our lowest 25th percentile will make math gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Think through math (Algebra support), differentiated instruction, SWAG (small group instruction), ELP, Flipped classroom model

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data analysis of student improvement using these strategies showed growth.

Action Steps to Implement

Think Through Math

Person Responsible Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

Differentiated Instruction

Person Responsible Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

SWAG (Small Group Instruction)

Person Responsible Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

ELP

Person Responsible Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With differentiating teaching styles, students will be able to utilize metacognitive strategies that work best for their learning
---	---

Measurable Outcome:	For the 2020-2021 school year, 81% of students will be proficient on the FSA SSS
----------------------------	--

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
---	---------------------

Evidence-based Strategy:	Flipped classroom model, differentiated instruction, Literacy in Science, SWAG (small group instruction), ELP, inquiry-based learning projects, Brain Pop, Gizmos
---------------------------------	---

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Classroom progress monitoring
---	-------------------------------

Action Steps to Implement

Differentiated Instruction

Person Responsible	Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)
---------------------------	--------------------------------------

SWAG (small group instruction)

Person Responsible	Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)
---------------------------	--------------------------------------

ELP

Person Responsible	Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)
---------------------------	--------------------------------------

Brain Pop

Person Responsible	Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)
---------------------------	--------------------------------------

Gizmos

Person Responsible	Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)
---------------------------	--------------------------------------

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Civics EOC Assessment Achievement

Measurable Outcome: For the 2020-2021 school year, 95% of the students will pass the Civics EOC Assessment with a score of 3 or higher

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Classroom lessons will integrate scaffolding and grouping to support the student's application of new skills and strategies. Civics EOC Bootcamp will utilize USA Test Prep, SWAG, and other standards-based activities to increase student achievement

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Increased student achievement utilizing standards-based learning goals and tracking

Action Steps to Implement

EOC Bootcamp

Person Responsible Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

USA Test Prep (Computer-Based Program)

Person Responsible Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

SWAG (Small Group Instruction)

Person Responsible Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

Scaffolding and Grouping

Person Responsible Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Formative and summative assessments will be utilized to monitor student progress and increase learning gains. This will be accomplished through various professional development opportunities and administrative walk through observations.

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.

Martinez Middle School will continue to build and maintain a positive school culture and environment through various methods. All community stakeholders are invited to collaborate with faculty and staff through the school PTSA and SAC. Families and community members are invited to attend monthly SAC meetings to monitor and assess the effectiveness of the School Improvement Plan. These meetings will be utilized to strengthen the relationship between our school and the community in which it serves. The PTSA is very active and plays an integral role in educating our parents. We hold curriculum and informational sessions for parents at the school both in the mornings and in the evenings throughout the year. Our school communicates with families and the community through Edsby, Canvas, various district-approved social media platforms, and the parent link telephone service to disseminate information to students' homes.

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: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00