

Martin County School District

Dr. David L. Anderson 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

Dr. David L. Anderson Middle School

7000 SE ATLANTIC RIDGE DR, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/ddlam

Demographics

Principal: Ebony Jarrett

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

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)	64%
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: B (61%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (55%)
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	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 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

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

Dr. David L. Anderson Middle School

7000 SE ATLANTIC RIDGE DR, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/ddlam

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">56%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">59%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

Be Equitable. Be Courageous. Be Proud.

Provide the school's vision statement.

ALL students high school ready without the need of remediation.

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
Aitken, Tim	Principal	School Leader
Lavere, Gina	Teacher, K-12	
Register, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	
Sigmon, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Webster, Andrew	Teacher, K-12	
McMurry, Diane	Assistant Principal	School leadership
Kemler, Ashley	Teacher, ESE	
Belvin, Tonya	Teacher, K-12	
McGrath, Susan	Teacher, K-12	
Axton, David	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Ebony Jarrett

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.*

8

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.*

21

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	64%
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: B (61%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (55%)
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	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	334	361	365	0	0	0	0	1060
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	29	17	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	65	54	0	0	0	0	172
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	75	54	0	0	0	0	195

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	42	50	33	0	0	0	0	125

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	5	0	0	0	0	27

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/2/2020

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	354	359	391	0	0	0	0	1104
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	11	16	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	79	120	0	0	0	0	307

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	9	10	9	0	0	0	0	28

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	4	3	0	0	0	22

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	354	359	391	0	0	0	0	1104
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	11	16	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	79	120	0	0	0	0	307

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	9	10	9	0	0	0	28

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	4	3	0	0	0	22

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	52%	62%	54%	49%	62%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	58%	54%	51%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	51%	47%	42%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	68%	74%	58%	74%	71%	56%
Math Learning Gains	61%	68%	57%	81%	72%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	55%	51%	74%	61%	50%
Science Achievement	64%	64%	51%	51%	57%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	87%	72%	60%	75%	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	54%	57%	-3%	54%	0%
	2018	45%	56%	-11%	52%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	42%	53%	-11%	52%	-10%
	2018	43%	57%	-14%	51%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	56%	62%	-6%	56%	0%
	2018	58%	63%	-5%	58%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	61%	64%	-3%	55%	6%
	2018	57%	63%	-6%	52%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	53%	60%	-7%	54%	-1%
	2018	64%	65%	-1%	54%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	65%	67%	-2%	46%	19%
	2018	70%	66%	4%	45%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	61%	58%	3%	48%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	60%	57%	3%	50%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	74%	-74%	67%	-67%
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	43%	77%	-34%	71%	-28%
2018	81%	79%	2%	71%	10%
Compare		-38%			

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%	75%	18%	61%	32%
2018	96%	70%	26%	62%	34%
Compare		-3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	65%	35%	57%	43%
2018	100%	61%	39%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	23	47	46	44	64	65	29				
ELL	19	46	52	39	51	49	26		59		

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	89	90		100	65				100		
BLK	36	40	33	53	48	56	38				
HSP	39	49	51	58	59	57	53		70		
MUL	44	49		61	49	30	50		70		
WHT	63	57	49	77	65	55	74		79		
FRL	40	48	46	60	58	55	53		70		
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	25	45	45	34	55	51	27	52			
ELL	21	49	46	51	59	51	24	65	57		
ASN	78	74		100	87				100		
BLK	36	64	55	53	67	74	48	70	42		
HSP	37	50	46	60	61	49	45	77	59		
MUL	56	50	27	74	72		69	73	36		
WHT	59	59	56	78	71	57	75	87	67		
FRL	40	52	49	62	64	53	52	76	51		
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	33	27	36	60	58	21	16	50		
ELL	19	40	34	52	74	66	20	28	23		
ASN	87	83		100	79			90	90		
BLK	29	39	32	59	77	63	30	62			
HSP	36	47	40	63	74	67	34	41	43		
MUL	50	44	55	82	91		62	55			
WHT	59	55	44	82	85	87	63	74	65		
FRL	36	45	40	65	77	70	38	45	42		

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	62
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	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	624
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	46
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	89
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	57
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	50
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	65
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	56
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 25% has the lowest performance.

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

Civics declined 12%. This was due to a reduced number of students who took the Civics EOC in 2019.

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.

ELA achievement is -2% compared to the state average.

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

ELA achievement +2% Recognizing that ELA achievement at AMS is lagging, we increased a focus on student choice reading and teacher/student conferencing.
 Science achievement +2% The science department has been working on a streamlined approach to teaching science content, spiraling it over 3 years.

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

The current environment of teaching and learning with students both in person and remotely is creating a new challenges for both students and teachers.

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

1. Improve ESE student performance in ELA and Math to reduce the gap
2. Improve ELL student performance in ELA and Math to reduce the gap
3. Increase the number of students who complete Algebra I
4. Provide professional development and support for new teachers at AMS

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ELL student population is achieving 19% proficiency in ELA; the learning gains are 46%, which indicates that less than half of the students are making significant growth towards reducing the achievement gap. In math, ELL students achieved 39% proficiency; learning gains are 51%. In science, 26% of ELL students reached a score of proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA learning gains to 53%. Increase Math learning gains to 60%. As learning gains increase year after year, students will reach proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Diane McMurry (mcmurrd@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Imagine Learning is being used in the Critical Thinking support class that every new ELL student is enrolled in. Additionally, ELL paras are using content materials to continue support in ELA classrooms. In math, students will have access to Math Splash to help reinforce foundational skills. ELL paras will support ELL students in ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies, and other classes as available.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	ELL students need support in language acquisition. As their language knowledge grows, their performance in ELA, Science, and Social Studies will also increase.

Action Steps to Implement

Currently, we have an open ELL ParaProfessional position that we have not been able to fill. Hiring the additional para will allow for even more classroom support for both students and teachers.

Person Responsible Diane McMurry (mcmurrd@martinschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our ESE student population is achieving 23% proficiency in ELA; the learning gains are 47%, which indicates that less than half of the students are making significant growth towards reducing the achievement gap. In math, ESE students achieved 44% proficiency; learning gains are 64%. In science, 29% of ESE students reached a score of proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA learning gains to 54%.
 Increase Math learning gains to 69%.
 As learning gains increase year after year, students will reach proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Provide consistent ESE support facilitators in the ELA and Math classrooms.

Evidence-based Strategy: ELA teachers and support facilitators to conference 1 on 1 with students about reading at least 1x per month.

In math, a Critical Thinking/Math support class has been established for 7th and 8th grade. Students also use the IXL math program to review and practice critical math skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Focus on choice reading to encourage students to read and accountability with student/teacher conferences.

IXL provides immediate feedback to students while they are practicing skills. Teachers are able to track student performance efficiently.

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure that ESE students meet with their monitor teachers on a regular basis. Scheduled into AMS class daily.

Person Responsible Kalie Jones (jonesk@martin.k12.fl.us)

#3. Other specifically relating to Increase participation in Algebra I

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: To increase student opportunities in high school and beyond, it is important for students to have the opportunity to take Algebra I in middle school.

Measurable Outcome: 100% of eligible students will be scheduled into Algebra I.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Andrew Webster (webstea@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Critical Thinking/Math support classes will be used to provide additional support for advancing students math. Based on prior year math teacher's recommendation, students will have this additional math support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Critical Thinking/Math support class is designed to pre-teach concepts that students will encounter in math. It also allows an opportunity to reinforce foundational math skills.

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure that CT/Math, AVID, or Support Facilitation is available for all students who need additional math support.

Person Responsible Diane McMurry (mcmurrd@martinschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The science department has been working on a spiraling approach to the 6-8 curriculum, and due to COVID, testing in 2019-2020 was cancelled. This would have been the first group of students to experience all 3 years of the spiral approach.

Measurable Outcome: 8th grade science will achieve an increase in proficiency on the 8th grade science assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tonya Belvin (belvint@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: GIZMOS, an interactive science program, can be used to provide students with science simulations. This can be used by all 3 grade levels, and by students who are in person as well as remote learners.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: With hybrid classrooms, hands-on demonstrations are difficult to accomplish, yet research shows that hands-on learning and application of learning helps students retain understanding.

Action Steps to Implement

Present info and request funding for GIZMOS

Person Responsible Nathaniel Morgan (morgann@martin.k12.fl.us)

Conduct professional development with science teachers on the effective use of GIZMOS in the classroom.

Person Responsible Tonya Belvin (belvint@martin.k12.fl.us)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: COVID-19 has changed the landscape of the school. Classes are simultaneously taught to students in person and remotely. As a result, teachers have had to make adjustments to how they teach. Student learning is directly related to teachers' instructional strategies. Teachers need to have multiple tools to use to meet the needs of diverse learners,

Measurable Outcome: 100% of new teachers and 70% of experienced teachers will participate in specialized professional development for integrating engaging technology-based instructional methods into their classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kristen Register (registk@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The AVID site team will develop customized professional development to be delivered through multiple sessions that teachers can select. Each session will consist of an instructional period followed by time for teachers to collaborate on implementation and planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research supports that having choice increases buy-in. Additionally, providing time for planning and implementation helps to ensure that teachers will use the content they are learning in the PD sessions.

Action Steps to Implement

AVID site team will survey staff and develop an offering of sessions based on teacher needs.

Person Responsible Kristen Register (registk@martin.k12.fl.us)

Professional Development will be conducted on Saturday, October 24. Participating teachers will be compensated for attendance.

Person Responsible Kristen Register (registk@martin.k12.fl.us)

Gather evidence of implementation and submit paperwork for compensation.

Person Responsible Diane McMurry (mcmurrd@martinschools.org)

Create an AMS Resource Google Classroom to provide resources for teachers and students

Person Responsible Diane McMurry (mcmurrd@martinschools.org)

#6. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

As of the start of the 2020-21 school year, 23 of the teacher allocations at AMS are either open, being filled by substitutes or have been filled with new teachers. Of the teachers who resigned, the average year of teaching experience is 9.5 years. Currently 14 of the open positions have been filled, and the average years of teaching experience is 2.5 years. Due to COVID-19, the school has experienced a significant loss of experienced teachers.

If we intend to have a positive impact on student learning, we must provide support for our teachers.

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.

Gaining support from our community stakeholders, families, and students is a priority. Multiple avenues of communication are utilized to share information, including social media such as Facebook and Twitter, the school website, phone calls and Zoom meetings. The school enjoys the support of a consistent PTSA and SAC. Through these avenues, parents have a means of communicating with the principal as well as staying abreast of what is happening at AMS.

Through our AVID site team, students are exposed to a rigorous curriculum and support through an AVID elective. The AVID site team also supports teachers throughout the school with professional development.

AMS participates in the Safe Schools Ambassador program. This year approximately twenty five students will be trained in the Safe Schools Ambassador program.

Social and Emotional Learning is addressed through the daily AMS class. In this class, students use various strategies and programs such as Suite 360 and circle discussions to explore social and emotional issues that are relevant to middle school students. In addition to 3 full time guidance counselors, AMS has 3 dedicated Americorp members who assist students in a mentor capacity.

The school has an active Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA) that incorporates members of the community and local businesses that help support the school. Events include participation in Family Nights and Open House. The School Advisory Council (SAC) is comprised of local business member and parents/ community members and staff who work together to allocate the school improvements funds to support student needs.

Increase Communication:

- + Add messages to the message boards at Parent-Pickup Loop
- + Add message through social media (Facebook) and Remind
- + Maintain the school website with upcoming/important information
- + Use a parent mini-resource center/parent liaison at school to help ELL parents
- + Continually increase community partnerships with local business
- + Community forum held throughout the school year for parents consisting of various topics offered in both English and Spanish
- + Changing PTSA/SAC meeting days and hours to accommodate more members / Using Zoom to accommodate virtual participation.

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: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Increase participation in Algebra I				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$4,125.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0361 - Dr. David L. Anderson Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$4,125.00
<i>Notes: GIZMO science program for all students</i>						
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning				\$5,250.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0361 - Dr. David L. Anderson Middle School	Other		\$5,250.00
<i>Notes: Stipend for facilitators and participants @ 25.00/hr.</i>						

6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$9,375.00