

Martin County School District

Martin County High 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	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

Martin County High School

2801 S KANNER HWY, Stuart, FL 34994

martinschools.org/o/mchs

Demographics

Principal: Cristina Selvidge

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	43%
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 (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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	25

Martin County High School

2801 S KANNER HWY, Stuart, FL 34994

martinschools.org/o/mchs

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)
High School 9-12	No	36%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

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

Martin County High School's Mission is to ensure quality learning for all.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Martin County High School's working draft vision is: Every student will graduate college and career capable.

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
Fabrizio, Al	Principal	
Skinner, Virginia	Assistant Principal	
Southwick, Shaun	Teacher, Career/Technical	
Herd, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	
Carbone, Kristin	Assistant Principal	
Cowles, Mark	Assistant Principal	
Siters, Kelli	Assistant Principal	
Knob, Sherrie	School Counselor	
	Teacher, K-12	
Hill, David	Teacher, K-12	
Sawczak, Susan	Teacher, K-12	
Barrett-Baxter, Ucola	Dean	
Parks, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	
DeWayne, Charles	Teacher, ESE	
Wozny, Erica	Teacher, K-12	
Juan-Gaspar, Miguel	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2011, Cristina Selvidge

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.*

0

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

130

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	43%
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 (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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	0	0	0	0	629	571	541	430	2171
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	44	50	38	166
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	6	2	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	87	25	38	151
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	107	98	60	268
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	85	98	76	384
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	52	60	43	241

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	102	94	67	340	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	5	4	20

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	93	70	106	323
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	6	1	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	54	56	85	197
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	134	119	97	462

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	56	51	66	192	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	93	70	106	323
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	6	1	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	54	56	85	197
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	134	119	97	462

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	56	51	66	192

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	59%	71%	56%	60%	67%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	59%	51%	53%	56%	49%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	55%	42%	40%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	59%	69%	51%	55%	63%	49%
Math Learning Gains	46%	52%	48%	58%	62%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	46%	45%	44%	59%	39%
Science Achievement	74%	82%	68%	73%	76%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	84%	73%	77%	79%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(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
09	2019	60%	61%	-1%	55%	5%
	2018	56%	62%	-6%	53%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	55%	59%	-4%	53%	2%
	2018	54%	59%	-5%	53%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	74%	-1%	67%	6%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	71%	73%	-2%	65%	6%
Compare		2%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	78%	3%	70%	11%
2018	77%	74%	3%	68%	9%
Compare		4%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	53%	75%	-22%	61%	-8%
2018	46%	70%	-24%	62%	-16%
Compare		7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	65%	-3%	57%	5%
2018	57%	61%	-4%	56%	1%
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	25	31	25	32	42	44	45	68		89	29
ELL	18	44	45	39	47	61	38	46		56	15
ASN	70	47		64	42		100				
BLK	29	40	36	38	49	48	40	61		100	30
HSP	42	49	43	47	44	49	58	67		76	38
MUL	61	57		50	33		60	83		93	38
WHT	69	60	48	68	48	52	83	88		96	69
FRL	39	45	43	45	39	47	59	68		81	40

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	45	45	34	48	43	62	60		80	21
ELL	13	35	38	21	40	49	27	39		35	20
ASN	73	87		60	64			70			
BLK	18	38	38	27	38	45	60	59		79	27
HSP	38	47	39	36	44	48	52	64		70	45
MUL	53	57		48	39		71	58		100	59
WHT	67	58	46	65	52	47	82	84		91	68
FRL	39	45	37	38	42	45	58	68		73	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	25	42	40	24	40	37	55	48		73	28
ELL	15	27	28	23	34	28	29	16		60	31
ASN	82	60		68	69						
BLK	33	40	37	25	44	32	48	60		100	18
HSP	43	42	31	41	47	32	59	57		74	48
MUL	42	45	50	42	53	67	58	75			
WHT	69	58	46	63	62	53	80	85		93	69
FRL	42	42	36	41	45	37	60	64		79	43

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	61
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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	674
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	42
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	65
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	59
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	68
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	51
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.

All tested areas are below District proficiency level. However there was an increase in proficiency from 2018-19 school year in all tested areas as well. Our SWD subgroup dropped in every tested area except for Social Studies (US History EOC). ELL students as a subgroup are also under performing compared to other subgroups of students. This pattern is consistent across all subject areas.

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

Overall, we did not have a decline in over all proficiency; in fact we increased in all areas. However, when looking at the subgroup data - it appears that SWD has a 20% drop in ELA LG L25% or Multi had a 25% decrease in SS Achievement

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

Our Algebra 1 EOC scores show the greatest gap between school average and state average. One of the contributing factors could be that we had an Algebra teacher leave mid-year.

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

Our ELL students proficiency rate increased by 5%. Teachers worked closely with ELL support teacher in addition to the Paraprofessionals. The US History teachers began to drill down to the data to address the needs of ELL students and ensured that students utilized their word-to-word dictionaries regularly in class. Teachers are using collaborative strategies that help to increase student engagement, but also pairs students so that they can use one another as an additional resource. Additionally, our ELL graduation rate increased to 21%. In addition our high stakes tested areas had intentional planning days where they were able to reflectively plan for instruction utilizing the Short Cycle Formative Assessment.

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

A glaring concern is that 66 students in grade 12 currently meet two or more Early Warning Systems indicators, where as there is a total of 192 students that meet two or more indicators.

Additionally, there is a significantly large amount of students that have below 90% attendance rate (323) and there are 462 students that have earned a Level 1 on a statewide assessment.

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

1. Subgroup Proficiency on all assessments
2. ELA Overall Proficiency
3. Math Overall Proficiency
4. AP/AICE Overall Proficiency
5. Graduation Rate
6. Attendance Rate

In terms of Professional Learning: Providing strategies to our teachers that support ELL students and their learning in addition to Culturally Relevant Teaching. Bridging these two pieces together will have a positive impact on student learning. District instructional coaches, especially our ELL support will be providing additional professional development specifically to help support our ELL students.

We will continue to incorporate Focused Note Taking since we are seeing teachers utilize this strategy frequently. Our goal is to ensure that students have different ways to effectively take and use classroom notes. Focused Note Taking has shown to increase student retention of learning, by making connections and reviewing nightly.

Short Cycle Formative Assessment strategies will continue to be a concentrated area of focus for our school.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA Overall Proficiency and Learning Gains; to close the achievement gaps of our entire population.
---	---

	Increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement level (3.0) on the FSA ELA assessment from 59% to 64%
--	--

Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percentage of the students overall making learning gains from 55% to 60% on FSA ELA.
----------------------------	---

	Increase ELA lower quartile (30%) achievement levels from level 1 to level 2 and from level 2 to level 3 for 60% of our students. (2018-19 44%)
--	--

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Al Fabrizio (fabriza@martin.k12.fl.us)
---	--

Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Short Cycle Formative Assessment 2. Focused Note Taking 3. Culturally Relevant Teaching 4. Inclusive Culture Committee 5. Flexible Grouping
---------------------------------	--

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Short Cycle Formative Assessment Utilization of Short Cycle Formative Assessment Process - which includes Common Formative Assessments, Classroom assessments, Common Quarterly Assessments (district provided), analyzing data to determine next instructional steps, providing feedback to students to support learning. 2. Focused Note Taking Emphasis on students taking notes that they will refer back to and use again and again. 3. Culturally Relevant Teaching Mindfulness of the needs of students - all students are different. Break barriers with building relationships 4. Inclusive Culture Committee Committee will help determine strategies to create an inclusive culture that will positively impact student success. 5. Flexible Grouping Teachers use data to group students and scaffold lessons - incorporating reach and extension activities. In some cases, teachers switch students to provide another way to support learning.
---	--

Action Steps to Implement

1. Intentional planning days for the 9 and 10 ELA teams.
2. Using the program ixl.com for our district to increase reading skills and strategies.
3. ELL planning and intervention days to support the ELL population at our school.
4. Short Cycle Formative Assessment where proficiency of the standard is at the core of the lesson.
5. Collaborative team process and the learning cycle.

Person Responsible	Danielle Farrell (farreld@martin.k12.fl.us)
---------------------------	---

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math: Algebra & Geometry Proficiency and Learning Gains; to close the achievement gaps of our entire population.
	Increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement level (3.0) on the Math EOCs (Algebra 1, Geometry) assessment from 59% to 64%
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percentage of the students overall making learning gains from 46% to 51% on the Math EOCs (Algebra 1, Geometry) assessment
	Increase Math lower quartile (30%) achievement levels from level 1 to level 2 and from level 2 to level 3 for 60% of our students.(2018-19 50%)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristin Carbone (carbonk@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Short Cycle Formative Assessment 2. Focused Note Taking 3. Culturally Relevant Teaching 4. Inclusive Culture Committee 5. Flexible Grouping <p>1. Short Cycle Formative Assessment Utilization of Short Cycle Formative Assessment Process - clarifying the learning intention, collecting student evidence from at the hinge point in a lesson, providing students with feedback that moves learning forward, utilizing students as learning resources, having student reflect on their understanding and learning. This utilization includes the use of Common Formative Assessments, Classroom assessments, Common Quarterly Assessments (district provided), analyzing data to determine next instructional steps, providing feedback to students to support learning.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Focused Note Taking Emphasis on students taking guided notes utilizing the focused note taking strategies and that they will refer back to and use again and again. 3. Culturally Relevant Teaching Mindfulness of the needs of students - all students are different. Break barriers with building relationships 4. Inclusive Culture Committee Committee will help determine strategies to create an inclusive culture that will positively impact student success. 5. Flexible Grouping Teachers use scaffold lessons - incorporating reach and extension activities. In some cases, teachers switch students to provide another way to support learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Intentional planning days for the Algebra and Geometry teams.
2. Instructional Strategies professional learning provided by district office - for teams.
3. Use of Math Nation and Math XL
4. Short Cycle Formative Assessment where proficiency of the standard is at the core of the lesson.
5. Collaborative team process and the learning cycle.

Person
Responsible Kristin Carbone (carbonk@martin.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Subgroup Performance in All Tested Subjects; performance of students in subgroups in tested areas for ELA and Algebra and Geometry are below proficiency level
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement level (3.0) on the FSA ELA Grade 9 assessment: Black 33% (8/24) to 45%, Hispanic 38% (72/190) to 45%, SWD 23% (15/66) to 30% , ELL 16% (16/98) to 28%</p> <p>Increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement level (3.0) on the FSA ELA Grade 10 assessment: Black 21% (5/24) to 35%, Hispanic 38% (54/144) to 45%, SWD 22% (12/54) to 30% , ELL 13% (8/61) to 28%</p> <p>Increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement level (3.0) on the Algebra 1 EOC assessment: Black 50% (9/18) to 60%, Hispanic 38% (46/120) to 54%, SWD 34% (19/56) to 39%, ELL 30% (19/64) to 40%</p> <p>Increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement level (3.0) on the Geometry EOC assessment: Black 32% (8/25) to 40%, Hispanic 50% (70/141) to 60%, SWD 30% (16/54) to 39%, ELL 38% (24/63) to 45%</p> <p>Increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement level (3.0) on Biology EOC: Black 36% (10/28) to 45%, Hispanic 58% (98/169) to 64%, SWD 49% (23/ 47) to 60%, ELL 36% (27/74) to 45%</p> <p>Increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement level (3.0) on the US History EOC: Black 65% (13/20) to 70%, Hispanic 64% (92/144) to 69%, SWD 71% (47/66) to 74% , ELL 44% (32/73) to 50%</p>
Person responsible for	[no one identified]

**monitoring
outcome:**

1. Short Cycle Formative Assessment; use of data to review and implement
2. Collaborative Team process
3. Culturally Relevant Teaching
4. Inclusive Culture Committee
5. Flexible Grouping

Work with Guiding Coalition Team to review Classroom Walk Through Data and update as appropriate the Look-Fors with focus on literacy and determine learning walk structure for 2020-21

Develop/Revise Look-Fors and determine learning walk structure - Google Doc

Create and administer a faculty survey addressing interactive engagement and student ownership of learning.

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Meet with District Coach Dr. White —Quarterly to review instructional walk data and identify needs

Review PLC Documents/Data with Dr. White Quarterly

Continue Professional Learning and Monitoring of the Short Cycle Formative Assessment

Reviewing the Cycle

Connecting the Cycle with Collaborative Teams

Providing models, resources

Subject area specific

Continue to integrate the Focused Note Taking Process and WICOR school-wide Data Dialogue in Fall and Spring

1. Short Cycle Formative Assessment

Utilization of Short Cycle Formative Assessment Process - which includes Common Formative Assessments, Classroom assessments, Common Quarterly Assessments (district provided), analyzing data to determine next instructional steps, providing feedback to students to support learning.

2. Focused Note Taking

Emphasis on students taking notes that they will refer back to and use again and again.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

3. Culturally Relevant Teaching

Mindfulness of the needs of students - all students are different. Break barriers with building relationships

4. Inclusive Culture Committee

Committee will help determine strategies to create an inclusive culture that will positively impact student success.

5. Flexible Grouping

Teachers use data to group students and scaffold lessons - incorporating reach and

extension activities. In some cases, teachers switch students to provide another way to support learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaborative teams to review subgroup data
2. Teachers use the Short Cycle Formative Assessment process
3. Work with district ELL Coach
4. Use of Focused Note Taking
5. Provide all ELL students with access to word-to-word dictionaries and content specific glossaries
6. Organize schedule for optimal use of Para Professionals to provide pushin support to ELL students
7. Push in support from Support Facilitators in core content classes

Person Responsible Virginia Skinner (skinnev@martin.k12.fl.us)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Attendance Rate; Data shows that our attendance rate is 86% as of March 2020. Our focus on the Attendance Rate is 90%

Measurable Outcome: Students will maintain attendance at or above 90%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kelli Sifers (sifersk@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Communication between school and parent/guardian.
2. Attendance at or above 90% in order to be able to participate in school functions/ activities.
3. Relationship building between faculty and students.
4. Intervention support

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence is found that higher attendance in school sustains sufficient GPA needed for graduation. Additionally, students are more likely to come to school when they care about a class or program. Tying 90% attendance expectations to extracurricular will increase attendance among those students participating.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Description and Rationale: Students will graduate College and Career Capable

Measurable Outcome:

Every student will graduate college and career capable measured by an increase in our overall grad rate, an increase in the number of students earning a College and Career Acceleration point, and an increase in the amount of Rigorous course offerings (AICE/AP).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Inclusion of subgroups in more rigorous programs (AICE/AP/CTE)
Identify subgroup students who could potential take AP/AICE/CT Courses next year. Work with these students to strengthen their foundations to be prepared for these courses. AICE coordinators will meet with these students and explain the AICE courses and benefits and ways to prepare for these courses. Teachers will use AVID strategies in core courses to assist with this preparation.

2. Addition of Fall B Session at IRSC - offering SLS
Identify students this semester who would be able to take SLS second semester to earn CCA and be eligible to take additional dual enrollment courses.

3. Addition of AICE Courses –
AICE English Language, AICE International World History, AICE US History, AICE Marine Science, AICE Art and Design, AICE Drama, AICE Environmental Management have been added to the course offering. Teachers have or will attend trainings and extension trainings on grading policies and content development.

1. Inclusion of subgroups in more rigorous programs (AICE/AP/CTE) By identifying students, teachers can offer additional support to prepare these students for AP/AICE/CT courses in the coming year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

2. Addition of Fall B Session at IRSC - offering SLS Students will be able to take SLS second semester to prepare them to take additional dual courses in the following years.

3. Addition of AICE Courses- With additional course offerings, students have more opportunities to take courses that are of interest and prepare them to be college and career capable.

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.

Biology: Although student proficiency remained at 73% and well above the state average the school will work to continue to see gains in the ELL, SWD, Black, and Hispanic student population. Evidence based strategies being used include: short cycle formative assessment, focused note-taking, culturally relevant teaching, and flexible grouping. The biology collaborative team will track and review student subgroup data through formative and summative assessment data and implement directed differentiation, remediation, and enrichment as needed as identified.

US History: Although student proficiency increased to 80% and well above the state average, it still remained lower than the district average. The school will work to continue to see gains in the ELL, SWD, Black, and Hispanic student population. Evidence based strategies being used include: short cycle formative assessment, focused note-taking, culturally relevant teaching, and flexible grouping. The biology collaborative team will track and review student subgroup data through formative and summative assessment data and implement directed differentiation, remediation, and enrichment as needed as identified.

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.

This year, MCHS has an intentional focus on building and maintaining an inclusive culture. Prior to the start of the school year, members of the administrative team met with communities leaders to begin the discussion process. We have developed an inclusive culture committee to collaborate with and discuss ways to address concerns and put strategies in place that will support an inclusive campus. This committee will have participation from community leaders, teachers, and students. Eventually, the Inclusive Culture Committee will be led by students. A focus on Culturally Relevant Teaching will continue to be a focus area for our staff.

MCHS also utilizes several avenues to maintain communication, increase involvement and keep parents informed of their child's progress, such as, but not limited to: FOCUS, a web-based electronic grading system reflecting up-to-date grades and attendance information, MCHS's website that includes "Alert Messages", photos of events, and school events and information. The website is continually updated with information, links and calendars to provide access to all students, parents and community members. We also use Blackboard Connect to send messages home to students and parents about important information such as test dates, key events, and more. An "All Call" goes home to parents when students miss one or more

classes.

Our Athletic Director has set up a website and social media pages to engage our students, parents, and community members and shared the world of MCHS athletics. A school social media 'twitter' has been created and is used to share information and photos as appropriate. Individual teachers and smaller groups use

Remind 101 to communicate with classes, teams, clubs and other groups.

For specific parents groups, we have hosted AVID/Cambridge Parent Nights which set out to explain the benefits and expectations of participation. Our ELL department hosted a parent night for Spanish speaking parents. This presentation was offered in Spanish-so parents had an opportunity to engage in conversation about our school and our systems in place to help students. Our Guidance Department also hosts Parent Nights to provide parents withvaluable information: Senior Night, Financial Literacy, FAFSA, etcetera. Additionally, there is a Advance Placement Parent committee that works together each year to celebrate achivement in the Advance Placement programa.

Our Volunteer Coordinator works closely with school employees, club and class sponsors, and the district volunteer coordinator as a liaison to the parent volunteers. MCHS set goals to increase participation of parents participating in school events, such as, parent conferences. Parents are also essential members and decision makers on the School Advisory Council at MCHS.

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				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance				\$1,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0031 - Martin County High School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,500.00
Notes: Registration for Inclusive Culture/Culturally Relevant Teaching training for teachers.						
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation				\$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0031 - Martin County High School	School Improvement Funds		\$4,500.00
Notes: AVID Institute Training for 6 teachers.						

Martin - 0031 - Martin County High School - 2020-21 SIP

			0031 - Martin County High School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: Dylan William Assessment Conference - 1 teacher and 1 administrator</i>			
			0031 - Martin County High School	School Improvement Funds		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: AICE Training for non-content teachers.</i>			
			0031 - Martin County High School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,500.00
			<i>Notes: Payment towards ACT/SAT Non-College Reportable costs for seniors still needing to meet the Graduation Requirement</i>			
Total:						\$11,500.00