

Martin County School District

Stuart 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Stuart Middle School

575 SE GEORGIA AVE, Stuart, FL 34994

martinschools.org/o/sms

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 8/24/2020

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
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 (65%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (64%)
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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Stuart Middle School

575 SE GEORGIA AVE, Stuart, FL 34994

martinschools.org/o/sms

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	42%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

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 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.

Stuart Middle School, in partnership with our community, fosters a collaborative learning environment that engages all students through authentic learning experiences. Students are challenged and empowered to achieve their maximum potential and equipped with the skills and knowledge necessary to become responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Stuart Middle School provides a collaborative learning community where students utilize the knowledge and skills required for solving real-world problems and creating authentic products.

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
Jarrett, Ebony	Principal	
Dawedeit, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	
Desreuisseau, Lori	Assistant Principal	
Pool, Monica	Instructional Coach	
Johnson, Juanita	Teacher, K-12	
Mariano, Valerie	Instructional Coach	
Martin, Brandt	Dean	
Mustafa, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	
Hubel, Laura	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/24/2020, Christopher Jones

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

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)	50%
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 (65%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (64%)
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	0	246	267	263	0	0	0	0	776	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	30	24	0	0	0	0	75	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	39	33	0	0	0	0	124	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	31	37	0	0	0	0	115	

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	41	30	27	0	0	0	0	98	

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	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	7	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/9/2020

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	290	285	295	0	0	0	0	870	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	31	36	0	0	0	0	95	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	6	0	0	0	0	15	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	15	0	0	0	0	27	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	53	52	0	0	0	0	164	

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	10	17	20	0	0	0	0	47	

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	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	7

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	290	285	295	0	0	0	0	870
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	31	36	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	6	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	15	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	53	52	0	0	0	0	164

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	10	17	20	0	0	0	0	47

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	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	7

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	68%	62%	54%	68%	62%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	58%	54%	61%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	51%	47%	45%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	72%	74%	58%	73%	71%	56%
Math Learning Gains	61%	68%	57%	74%	72%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	55%	51%	62%	61%	50%
Science Achievement	63%	64%	51%	64%	57%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	96%	87%	72%	85%	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	66%	57%	9%	54%	12%
	2018	62%	56%	6%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	63%	53%	10%	52%	11%
	2018	68%	57%	11%	51%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	74%	62%	12%	56%	18%
	2018	65%	63%	2%	58%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	60%	64%	-4%	55%	5%
	2018	64%	63%	1%	52%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	64%	60%	4%	54%	10%
	2018	72%	65%	7%	54%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	72%	67%	5%	46%	26%
	2018	71%	66%	5%	45%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	59%	58%	1%	48%	11%

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	96%	77%	19%	71%	25%
2018	89%	79%	10%	71%	18%
Compare		7%			
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	99%	75%	24%	61%	38%
2018	100%	70%	30%	62%	38%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	65%	35%	57%	43%
2018	96%	61%	35%	56%	40%
Compare		4%			

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	28	48	50	36	37	27	21		23		
ELL	24	33	39	38	37	35					

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	87	40		80	60						
BLK	39	54	52	44	39	32	33				
HSP	57	50	30	67	53	39	53		47		
MUL	72	65		66	58	60	73		62		
WHT	74	68	63	78	66	47	67	95	72		
FRL	53	55	50	57	51	40	49		48		
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	27	43	37	44	59	50	24	59	21		
ELL	29	42	38	42	68	76	36				
ASN	67	67		80	87						
BLK	35	49	30	43	64	57	26	79			
HSP	63	56	47	69	72	54	57	83	46		
MUL	76	76	60	70	74		30	100			
WHT	69	64	50	79	79	64	68	90	57		
FRL	51	56	42	62	71	59	41	85	39		
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	30	39	26	38	54	45	29	64	21		
ELL	27	43	45	39	66	68	25	64			
ASN	92	77		100	82						
BLK	26	40	35	33	48	39	26	62			
HSP	57	50	42	62	70	63	43	82	31		
MUL	73	63	38	72	56		64	90	50		
WHT	75	66	49	79	79	70	72	88	45		
FRL	56	52	42	61	65	55	53	79	21		

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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	633
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	67
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	42
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	50
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	65
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	70
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	50
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.

According to our data, our Students With Disabilities performed the lowest. Teachers and Facilitators need continuous growth in professional knowledge on how to co-teach to meet the needs of the students. In 2018-2019 teachers and facilitators received initial training from FDLRS on the co-teaching model, but data has indicated that teachers and facilitators need additional training. Additionally, in 2019-2020 the literacy coach and Instructional Problem Solving Coach created a learning walk cohort with the three math facilitators on co-teaching. The cohort visited another middle school to see the co-teaching model, participated in learning walks to each other's classrooms, and created a checklist of best practices to support the needs of ESE teachers in a co-teaching model. The goal is to continue this practice among the math facilitators and start a cohort with the three ELA facilitators.

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

7th Grade Math declining at -8% proficient. This is due to the gaps in the foundational math knowledge. All of our math teachers and math facilitators participated in Project CRISS and worked alongside the District Math Instructional Coaches to meet the needs of our students. We will continue this partnership with the District Math Instructional Coach and focus on using more manipulatives in small group math instruction to foster a multi-sensory approach and close the foundational gaps. In addition, L1 students are receiving intervention support in a Math intervention class that focuses on reinforcing and enhancing what is being taught in the grade level math classes. Additional support and practice materials are provided in small group instruction with the concepts that students are struggling with. Teachers used multiple strategies (one to one, small group, Prodigy, etc...) to close

the gaps and reinforce current math concepts. The intensive math classes also do a weekly grade check to monitor progress in Math and reteach when necessary.

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.

Math lowest 25th percentile is at 43% proficient and the state average is at 51% proficiency. Math teachers were trained in CRISS strategies to be implemented in their classroom. Math Level 1 students are placed in an intensive reading class to support them in their math skills. Teachers are also meeting in their grade level CLT to share best practices, review common assessments, and disaggregate data.

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

ELA 8th grade with a 9% proficiency growth. ELA teachers utilized a guaranteed and viable curriculum throughout the school year. Teachers worked during collaborative learning teams (CLTs) to examine and break down standards. After developing learning goals, teachers proceeded to plan out which standards to teach and selected resources and texts that they would use in all of their classes. Teachers also created common assessments to monitor student progress. The common assessments proved to be vital as teachers were able to return to CLTs with a clear purpose. Teachers examined their respective data and discussed ways to spiral in standards when students showed that they were developing a specific skill but needed further practice. Furthermore, teachers worked together to brainstorm ways that they could implement additional practice and reteaching in small groups when necessary, which provided students with differentiated instruction based on their needs.

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

Any students with two or more indicators listed above is brought to the attention of the Leadership Team for Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) review and for creating an intervention plan. The MTSS team meets weekly and is made up of our Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Assistant Principal of Discipline, District MTSS Coach, Dean of Students, Intervention Specialist, IPS Coach, Literacy Coach, and guidance counselors. Our assigned school psychologist as well as our District Social worker sometimes participate. This problem-solving team reviews records related to academic progress, attendance, and behavior from a variety of databases. Teachers' Focus notes, which include parent contact and classroom interventions, are reviewed by the team. The MTSS Leadership Team documents information and brainstorms strategies and/or interventions to write an action plan. The team assigns individuals to monitor responses to intervention and to report results. The intervention specialist is monitoring certain students by meeting with them on a regular basis and communicating with teachers. Students may also be referred to an Americorp mentor through the MTSS process for support with academics, attendance, behavior, and other skill development. For students with Tier 2 behavior needs, Check In/Check Out is used to improve students' awareness of their own behaviors and success in the classroom. For students with Tier 3 behavior needs, Classroom Behavior Support Plans are created, reviewed with teachers, and implemented in the classroom. All interventions are progress monitored by the intervention specialist and data is shared with the MTSS team.

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

1. Increase Proficiency of ESE students.
2. Increase Proficiency of ELL students.
3. Increase Proficiency of Lowest 25% in Math.
4. Increase Proficiency of Lowest 25% in ELA.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

To close the achievement gap among our ESE students, we have utilized Project CRISS metacognitive strategies for each core content along with facilitator support in all tested core contents. In ELA we have implemented a tier 3 SPIRE class for our students that are still deficient in phonemic awareness. For Math and ELA tier 2 support we have implemented a intervention class. The goal is to support all Level 1 and Low Level 2 students by providing additional foundation and grade-level support for ELA and Math. We have continued with the use of Snap and Read and Co-writer for students who would benefit from this specific accommodation. We also are incorporating more multisensory intervention support with manipulatives to close the gaps for our tier 2 students. Our grade-level content CLTs continue to meet twice a week, which includes the facilitator, to unwrap standards, intentionally plan, create CFAs, administer CFAs and analyze data for reteaching and enrichment. The CLT also implements the problem-solving process for district assessments and data analysis. SMS is continuing the collaborative teaching model to support ESE students in general education classes. Monitor Teachers will be invited to MTSS meetings to report on progress (parent communication, intervention results, etc.) For IEP meetings and documenting present levels of performance thoroughly, the ESE teachers will have multiple sources of data in the draft IEP (ie. teacher input, support logs, accommodations checklist, grades, F & P records, Freckle diagnostic, CQA scores, referral data, absences, etc). The ESE teachers will communicate with the Literacy Coach to help with interpretation of reading data.

Measurable Outcome:

50% of students with disabilities will be proficient on the Math Florida Standards Assessment in Spring of 2021.
50% of students with disabilities will be proficient on the ELA Florida Standards Assessment in Spring of 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Pool (poolm@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Project CRISS Metacognition Strategies
Problem Solving Process (Adapted from National School Reform)
Freckle Reading Intervention in Tier 2 Reading Courses
Structured Literacy Approach in Tier 2 & Tier 3 Reading Courses

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

These evidence based strategies are selected from what works clearing house and research in the educational field.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze and Present Reading & Math Diagnostic Data.
2. CLTs analyze data and set an action plan based on the Problem Solving Process
3. Analyze and Present ELA & Math Adequate Progress Monitoring Assessment Data
4. CLTs analyze data and revisit original action plan
5. Repeat steps 3 & 4 for the Second Adequate Progress Monitoring Assessment

Person Responsible

Monica Pool (poolm@martin.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers and ELL Paraprofessionals are working with students to assist with core content instruction. Snap & Read has been implemented in all core content classes to provide students with access to the text in their native language. The program also provides options for students to listen to the text in English depending on their proficiency level. Students and teachers have the opportunity to change the reading speed, slowing down the pace if needed. This feature will help build reading fluency and support student comprehension as they work through processing the text. Students who are working on Imagine Learning weekly, receive a word-to-word dictionary and glossary. Additionally, students are receiving additional support in intervention for Math and ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	50% of students with disabilities will be proficient on the Math Florida Standards Assessment in Spring of 2021. 45% of students with disabilities will be proficient on the ELA Florida Standards Assessment in Spring of 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Pool (poolm@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Project CRISS Metacognition Strategies Problem Solving Process (Adapted from National School Reform) Freckle Reading Intervention in Tier 2 Reading Courses Structured Literacy Approach in Tier 2 & Tier 3 Reading Courses Snap & Read Adaptive Technology Imagine Learning Instructional Software
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These evidence based strategies are selected from what works clearing house and research in the educational field.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze and Present Reading & Math Diagnostic Data.
2. CLTs analyze data and set an action plan based on the Problem Solving Process
3. Analyze and Present ELA & Math Adequate Progress Monitoring Assessment Data
4. CLTs analyze data and revisit original action plan
5. Repeat steps 3 & 4 for the Second Adequate Progress Monitoring Assessment

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Increase Math Proficiency: In collaborative teams, teachers are unwrapping standards to ensure that they have a firm understanding of what students need to know and be able to do. The Math Instructional Team Leader, along with support from the District Math coaches, are ensuring implementation with fidelity of District frameworks. In addition, the CLT is disaggregating data from district quarterly assessments and school-based CFAs. Critical Thinking Tier 2 support in Math has been provided for our L1 students. The District Math coaches are working closely with those teachers to make sure that instruction is engaging and differentiated based on the needs of students. There is a focus on incorporating more hands-on learning. The goal is to make sure that students have a clearer understanding of the skills being taught as they practice them in multiple ways. Also, SMS is continuing after school tutoring with JBHS NHS students to provide FREE additional math support.

Increase Science Proficiency: Teachers are working together in collaborative teams to unwrap standards, share best practices, and ensuring that the district frameworks are being implemented with fidelity. The Assistant Principal of Curriculum and the District Coordinator of Science are working with teachers to make sure that instruction is differentiated and engaging by sharing best practices, remediation activities, labs, and computer based activities. One of the main focuses is to incorporate more hands-on learning to practice the Nature of Science throughout the entire year as these standards are typically the lowest achieving for all eighth grade students. In addition, the team will look closely at data from target standards CFAs as well as data from CQAs to determine what impact the best strategy practices are having on assessment results.

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.

Stuart Middle School works closely with our Parent, Teacher, Student Association (PTSA) and School Advisory Council (SAC). The organizations offer opportunities for parents to volunteer, gain an understanding of school culture and the policies and procedures of the School Improvement Process. At SMS, parents participate in fundraising projects that financially support our Positive Behavior Intervention/Support (PBIS) initiatives. PBIS is designed to improve students' social-emotional and academic outcomes where students feel they have an equal opportunity to be successful. We create opportunities to motivate students and acknowledge them for meeting ROAR expectations through the ROAR system. The students are rewarded for meeting expectations for respect, on task behavior, acceptably dressed and responsibility

They can be rewarded by every adult on campus digitally or the use of physical cards. The ROAR Card economy system is how students can earn rewards and redeem those ROAR cards in a variety of ways. This allows our school to give incentives for students who meet or exceed published School-Wide Expectations. Parents volunteer at The Scholastic Book Fair, PBIS Sponsored Events, as well as support Band, Chorus, and Drama Events. We are always looking for ways to encourage parent involvement with their students in middle school years.

Also, the school has two guidance counselors, Heather Hazlett and Chris Ralph. They divide the student body into two groups. Each counselor supports and refers students to mental health counseling agencies in our area if needed. Mental health counseling is provided on-site through a partnership with Tykes and Teens and Helping People Succeed. We have partnered with the Boys and Girls Club (AmeriCorps) to provide positive mentoring for our at-risk students on campus. In addition, our IPS coach, Valerie Mariano, and our Intervention Teacher, Courtney Mustafa, work with specific students on interventions. They assist teachers and facilitators in supporting students who are at-risk. To support the intervention needs of our students teachers have received trauma informed care professional development from Tykes and Teens, our local Mental Health agency, who provided strategies on how to make positive connections with all students.

In addition, every Tuesday, our entire student body is broken into small groups of 22 students or less. In these groups, students work with a teacher, administrator, guidance counselor, or coach with peers of the same grade. Through these small groups, students participate in restorative circles and other team building activities. This class is designed to offer academic support and growth mindset strategies to help students be successful in their academic futures and character development.

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: Students with Disabilities				\$900.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3361	120-Classroom Teachers	0021 - Stuart Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$900.00
			Notes: After school tutoring beginning in the winter of 2021. The tutoring is provided to all SMS students by certified teachers. ESE students that are struggling are invited to attend and parents are contacted to encourage attendance.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3361	120-Classroom Teachers	0021 - Stuart Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$0.00
			Notes: After school tutoring beginning in the winter of 2021. The tutoring is provided to all SMS students by certified teachers. ELE students that are struggling are invited to attend and parents are contacted to encourage attendance.			
Total:						\$900.00