

Martin County School District

Indiantown 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	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Indiantown Middle School

16303 SW FARM RD, Indiantown, FL 34956

martinschools.org/o/ims

Demographics

Principal: Jeff Raimann

Start Date for this Principal: 9/21/2020

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)	100%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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	24

Indiantown Middle School

16303 SW FARM RD, Indiantown, FL 34956

martinschools.org/o/ims

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;">100%</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;">96%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Raimann, Jeff	Principal	
Bickley, William	Assistant Principal	
Norman, Melora	Assistant Principal	
Skerven, Kim	Teacher, K-12	Guiding Coalition
Macedo, Consuelo	Teacher, K-12	Guiding Coalition
Bennett, Nancy	Teacher, K-12	Guiding Coalition
Mesorana, Matt	Teacher, K-12	Guiding Coalition
Monks, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	Guiding Coalition
Leister, Laura	Instructional Coach	IC, Guiding Coalition, Interventionist

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/21/2020, Jeff Raimann

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

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)	100%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	133	161	165	183	0	0	0	0	642
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	30	52	44	57	0	0	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	27	30	55	54	0	0	0	0	166
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	30	25	34	43	0	0	0	0	132
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	25	26	39	43	0	0	0	0	133

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	3	9	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	8	4	0	0	0	0	28

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/23/2020

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	142	161	173	165	0	0	0	0	641
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	17	31	30	34	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	1	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	40	58	63	66	0	0	0	0	227

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	33%	62%	54%	35%	62%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	58%	54%	52%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	51%	47%	50%	45%	44%

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

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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	27%	57%	-30%	54%	-27%
	2018	34%	56%	-22%	52%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	31%	53%	-22%	52%	-21%
	2018	30%	57%	-27%	51%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	37%	62%	-25%	56%	-19%
	2018	36%	63%	-27%	58%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	46%	66%	-20%	45%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	88%	75%	13%	61%	27%
2018	85%	70%	15%	62%	23%
Compare		3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	65%	30%	57%	38%
2018	100%	61%	39%	56%	44%
Compare		-5%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	38	41	39	60	51	11				
ELL	18	37	41	50	61	52	19		45		
BLK	29	39	33	61	72	65	26				
HSP	32	45	44	60	63	53	30	93	66		
WHT	53	63		69	59		54				
FRL	33	46	44	61	64	56	32	94	73		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	15	35	29	35	51	39	16	46	10		
ELL	20	40	39	49	60	52	17	40	67		
BLK	24	42	37	48	52	42	26	67	80		
HSP	34	43	38	59	61	50	31	61	75		
WHT	42	61		56	71						
FRL	33	44	38	58	61	50	31	64	76		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	11	48	52	34	53	42	11	25			
ELL	17	46	50	42	50	51	17	38	59		
BLK	33	48	45	39	55	53	40	36			
HSP	35	51	50	55	55	55	32	49	75		
WHT	32	65		56	45		33				
FRL	35	52	50	54	53	49	33	48	75		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	545
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	60
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	55
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.

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

SY19 - Grade 5 Science Achievement: 27% Proficiency (-17% MCSD Title 1 Elem Schools Avg)
 SY19 - Grade 8 Science Achievement: 32% Proficiency (-16% MCSD Title 1 Middle Schools Avg)

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

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

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

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

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

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

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

Ending the decline in attendance rate over a 5-year span, which can impact student achievement outcomes.

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

1. Increase the percentage of lowest quartile students making ELA learning gains.
2. Increase the percentage of ESE and ELL students making ELA learning gains.
3. Increase school-wide attendance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus: Increase the percentage of students making ELA learning gains.

Overall proficiency from SY18 to SY19 remained at 34% (grades 6-8); 33% (grades 5-8)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Increase in learning gains (2%) from SY18 (44%) to SY19 (46%)
 MCSD Title 1 Middle Schools Avg. ELA LGs 50% (-2%)
 Cohort Data:
 LG decreased from 4th grade to 5th grade, 14% points
 LG increased from 5th grade to 6th grade, 8% points
 LG decreased from 6th grade to 7th grade, 3% points

Increase in LG of L25 (6%) from SY18 (38%) to SY19 (44%)
 MCSD Title 1 Middle Schools Avg. ELA L25 LGs 47% (-3%)
 Cohort Data:
 L25 LGs decreased from 4th grade to 5th grade, 23% points

Measurable Outcome:

SY21:
 ELA Achievement 39%
 ELA Learning Gains 56%
 ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains 49%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Ensure standards-based instruction with aligned learning target and well-defined performance task with clear success criteria

Evidence-based Strategy:

Move toward a more balanced literacy approach integrating various modalities of literacy instruction, including a renewed focused on independent & guided reading in new Reading courses

Continue to refine MTSS process

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The goal of standards-based instruction is to provide each student an opportunity to produce evidence of proficiency of grade-level standards. The bulk of this work occurs in planning, including unpacking the grade-level content standard into smaller chunks and designing a task that requires students produce evidence at the complexity level of the standard.

Research has firmly established the correlation between time spent reading and reading achievement. This includes increased engagement and motivation, improved comprehension and vocabulary, increased fluency, and development of background knowledge.

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

Action Steps to Implement

Continue to ensure Standard - Learning Target - Learning Task alignment through weekly Classroom Walk-Through data trends collection and follow-up coaching supports.

Implement self-selected independent reading time in each reading block, each day, for every student.

Teachers will use online reading journals to confer with students and provide feedback accordingly.

Using diagnostic and benchmark data, students are placed into intervention groups to receive support in reading instruction. In the fifth grade, iReady diagnostic results, historical data, and L25 data was used to identify groups of students who needed instruction in phonics. This group ended up being around 40 students, with 74% of the fifth grade being “at risk” for tier three intervention per the iReady data. A special schedule was created that allowed every student in the fifth grade to receive 25-30 minutes of intervention instruction, four days a week. Those students needed phonics instruction will be placed with an ELA teacher who will provide them with intervention using the Phonics for Reading program. The remaining students will be dispersed among the math and science teachers who will provide them with reading supports using science-based information text and math word problems. The tier two and tier three students will be progress monitored using EasyCBM every week to two weeks. Sixth-eighth grade students receive tier two and three interventions through Read180, System44, Brightfish, and SPIRE. These students are progress monitored consistently using data from the respective programs as well as the reading comprehension assessments available through EasyCBM.

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: Increase the percentage of ESE students making ELA learning gains. This subgroup has been designated for targeted support and intervention under ESSA. ELA Achievement SWD 16% ELA Learning Gains SWD 38% ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains 41%
Measurable Outcome:	SY21: ELA Achievement SWD 21% ELA Learning Gains 48% ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains 46%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melora Norman (normanm@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	S.P.I.R.E. Phonics Instruction for ESE students that need intensive support (full-time ESE teacher) Classroom Walkthroughs with targeted "look-fors" to improve identification of best practices for supporting SWDs and effective collaboration between Support Facilitators and classroom teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	S.P.I.R.E.® is a research-proven reading intervention program. It is designed to build reading success through an intensive, structured, and spiraling curriculum that incorporates phonological awareness, phonics, spelling, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension in a systematic 10-Step lesson plan. CWTs are a tool for identifying data trends and driving continuous improvement.

Action Steps to Implement

- Hire full-time S.P.I.R.E-trained ESE teacher; purpose one ESE paraprofessional to assist with differentiated instruction.
- Identify and enroll qualifying students.
- Verify learning by tracking student growth in all Reading Intervention courses.

- Develop targeted "look-fors."
- Publish targeted-CWT schedule for Administration, Campus Instructional Leaders, ESE Specialist and Support Facilitators.
- Track data trends and communicate with stakeholders.
- Meet regularly with ESE department to build collective efficacy and problem solve.

Person Responsible Melora Norman (normanm@martin.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Area of Focus: Increase the percentage of ELL students making ELA learning gains.
Description and Rationale: ELL ELA Achievement 18%
 ELL ELA Learning Gains 37%
 ELL ELA Learning Gains Lowest Quartile 41%

Measurable Outcome: ELL ELA Achievement 23%
 ELA Learning Gains 51%
 ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains 48%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]
 Utilize Imagine Learning with fidelity and monitor reports to support language acquisition
 District ELL coaching support and training to embed language acquisition support strategies within instructional practices and content area.

Evidence-based Strategy: Interactive notebooks will be utilized during small group instruction in reading classes. This work will focus on:
 Explicit and progressive phonics instruction
 Print Concept/phonemic awareness
 Word study
 Reading strategies
 ELA teachers will work with Interventionist to implement guided reading groups to support English language learners.
 Imagine Learning program has been studied and statistically significant positive effect has been found for English language learners shown in Journal of Research and Reading study.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Interactive notebooks are ideally suited to the needs of English learners as a place to record learning, develop proficiency, and actively engage and take ownership for learning.
 Guided reading is an important component of a balanced literacy program. The same effective strategies used with native English speakers are used with ELLs; however, scaffolds must be added for support. Research-based supports include carefully selected text, building background knowledge, frontloading new vocabulary, and allowing ELL students frequent opportunities to respond to text.

Action Steps to Implement

- Communicate expectations for monitoring and verifying learning of ELL students utilizing Imagine Learning program.
- Offer training as needed to support teachers and ELL paraprofessionals in using Imagine Learning with students.
- Maintain a staff of five ELL paraprofessionals to work collaboratively with teachers, students, and parents.
- Focus on planning for guided reading during Collaborative Learning Team meetings and analysis of

student learning evidence.

Develop ELL coaching support calendar of staff training and coaching support.

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

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Area of focus: Decrease the percentage of students with high rates of absenteeism (at or below 90% attendance)
 We currently have 417 students at or above 95% attendance (which is currently 40/43 days). That’s about 65% of our school, including both unexcused and excused absences.

Measurable Outcome: 75% of students at or above 95% attendance by end of the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lauren Garnett (garnetl@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Attendance will be increased through a combination of student and staff intervention and action. Front office staff will call each absent student daily, scheduling parent conferences with school counselors when student absence has reached a threshold of five unexcused absences or more. School counselors will follow district attendance protocol, including mailed letters at five or more unexcused absences, to be repeated every five additional absences. Students will be referred to CINS/FINS and the School Services Field Officer where appropriate.

Upon a student’s return to school after a period of high absenteeism, they will meet with an attendance team member fortnightly to review progress. Where appropriate, students will be provided with tutoring opportunities and the opportunity to make-up missed work which may become a barrier to further education.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Truancy prevention programs outlining steps for intervention, including letters and parent conferences, as well as individual and small group counseling for students, have been supported through many academic studies. Chronic absenteeism has been shown to lead to decreased academic performance and an increase in high-risk behavior.

Programs include focuses on early intervention, continued support, and positive family and community involvement.

Action Steps to Implement

Create/implement school counseling lessons aimed at improving social skills, digital skills, and academic support to address social/emotional sources of school avoidance and improve efficacy of remote learning.

To be monitored by school counseling team.

Person Responsible Lauren Garnett (garnetl@martinschools.org)

Initiate individual and small group counseling sessions to provide additional intervention and enrichment time for students.

To be monitored by school counseling team.

Person Responsible Lauren Garnett (garnetl@martinschools.org)

Provide parents with resources and strategies to help their children succeed academically and socially, and assist them with prioritizing attendance in the home. Information to be provided through parent conferences and school-wide bulletins/newsletters.

To be monitored by school counseling team.

Person Responsible Lauren Garnett (garnetl@martinschools.org)

Work collaboratively with teachers and staff to reinforce student attendance as a high priority, creating a cohesive message to deliver to the classroom and to chronically absent students. Information to be provided through staff-wide emails, meetings, and public bulletins/newsletters.

To be monitored by school counseling team.

Person Responsible Lauren Garnett (garnetl@martinschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

See above, as all concerns were addressed as Areas of Focus.

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.

Indiantown Middle school addresses building a positive school culture by first building a solid foundation with the staff. Throughout the year, staff meet to take part in sessions focusing on growth in areas such as classroom management, building classroom community and relationships, the importance of routines and procedures, how to deescalate classroom disruptions, etc. These sessions follow with breakout sessions that are voluntary and give the staff a chance to meet with a smaller group and really dig into areas that they want to strengthen. We support building a positive school culture by modeling the behaviors that we wish to see from our students.

Meanwhile, the core PBIS team meets monthly to problem solve around our school-wide behavior data, identify strategies to improve weak areas, plan and provide students with opportunities to be rewarded for making positive choices, and support the staff. We have team members that reach out to the community to help provide funding and resources to make our initiative a successful one, including fundraising opportunities. It is important that the community is aware of the of the work being done on our campus, thus we consistently share initiatives through our social media platforms.

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: ELA				\$46,729.74
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0221 - Indiantown Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$46,200.00
			<i>Notes: Intervention Teacher/Coaching position, in which the teacher will be able to target specific students that are in need of additional intervention throughout the day in ELA. In addition, this teacher will also serve in a coaching capacity, supporting fellow teachers with lesson planning, modeling instructional strategies and providing professional supports for the various needs of our students.</i>			
			0221 - Indiantown Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$259.74
			<i>Notes: Scholastic Scope, Language Arts monthly magazine to support new Creative Writing elective</i>			
			0221 - Indiantown Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$270.00
			<i>Notes: Digital magazines to be used for MTSS interventions to support our struggling readers by providing reading strategies through a highly interactive and engaging science text.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners				\$57,332.06
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0221 - Indiantown Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$40,000.00
			<i>Notes: Bilingual Reading Teacher to provide intensive reading courses to IMS students who are limited-English proficient.</i>			
			0221 - Indiantown Middle School			\$17,332.06
			<i>Notes: Parent Liaison to provide communication and assistance for our families to support student achievement.</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance				\$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0221 - Indiantown Middle School	Other		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: PBIS funds to support attendance initiatives for struggling students.</i>			
Total:						\$105,061.80