

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## **Table of Contents**

| School Demographics            | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 21 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 37 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 38 |

Martin - 0051 - J. D. Parker School Of Technology - 2021-22 SIP

## J. D. Parker School Of Technology

1010 SE 10TH ST, Stuart, FL 34996

martinschools.org/o/jdpes

Demographics

## Principal: Melissa Riviotta

Start Date for this Principal: 9/21/2021

| <b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)   | Active  |
|---|---|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| 2020-21 Title I School  | Yes   |
| 2020-21 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3)   | 100%  |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an<br>asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged<br>Students |
| School Grades History   | 2018-19: C (51%)<br>2017-18: C (53%)<br>2016-17: C (51%)  |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Inf   | ormation*   |
| SI Region   | Southeast   |
| Regional Executive Director   | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield  |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle   | N/A   |
| Year  |   |
| Support Tier  |   |
| ESSA Status   |   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. F   | or 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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

#### 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               | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 21 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 38 |

Martin - 0051 - J. D. Parker School Of Technology - 2021-22 SIP

## J. D. Parker School Of Technology

1010 SE 10TH ST, Stuart, FL 34996

#### martinschools.org/o/jdpes

#### **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gra<br>(per MSID F   |          | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economical<br>Chool Disadvantaged (FRL) F<br>(as reported on Survey |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|----------|------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Elementary S<br>PK-5                 | chool    | Yes                    | 100%  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Primary Servic</b><br>(per MSID F | • •      | Charter School         | (Reporte  | Minority Rate<br>ed as Non-white<br>Survey 2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K-12 General Ec                      | lucation | No                     |   | 74%   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| School Grades Histo                  | ry       |                        |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year<br>Grade                        | 2020-21  | <b>2019-20</b><br>C    | <b>2018-19</b><br>C   | <b>2017-18</b><br>C                           |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| School Board Approv                  | /al      |                        |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### 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.

To educate all learners for success.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

J D Parker Elementary strives to cultivate learning experiences for ALL to strengthen a DIVERSE, RESILIENT, and SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITY through trust, compassion, stability, and hope.

#### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

| Name                  | Position<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|-----------------------|------------------------|---|
| Addorisio,<br>Jessica | Instructional<br>Coach | The role of the instructional coach is essential to school improvement for JD<br>Parker Elementary. In a creative hybrid model, each teacher is in the<br>classroom teaching 1/2 of the day and the other 1/2 of the day providing<br>instructional coaching to expand the potential and impact of professional<br>learning. The creative coaching model provides more concentration to<br>specific grade-level teams and teachers to enhance their instructional<br>practices. Data collected through quarterly feedback obtained by teachers<br>suggests instructional coaches are not only welcomed but valued as part of<br>staff professional learning. Instructional coaches align their awareness of<br>school improvement initiatives to support the following: collaborative<br>learning team leads, design and facilitate Professional learning using<br>Benchmark curriculum, facilitated planning sessions with individual teachers<br>and grade levels after school, facilitation of planning events for effective<br>instructional strategies related to core content areas, student engagement,<br>and critical content; team and teacher goal setting through using summative<br>and formative data; provide the Coaching Cycle as it is intended using Jim<br>Knight's model to demonstrate lessons or segments of lessons to teachers,<br>side by side teaching and provide feedback after observing. |
| Hawkins ,<br>Jamie    | Instructional<br>Coach | The role of the instructional coach is essential to school improvement for JD<br>Parker Elementary. In a creative hybrid model, each teacher is in the<br>classroom teaching 1/2 of the day and the other 1/2 of the day providing<br>instructional coaching to expand the potential and impact of professional<br>learning. The creative coaching model provides more concentration to<br>specific grade-level teams and teachers to enhance their instructional<br>practices. Data collected through quarterly feedback obtained by teachers<br>suggests instructional coaches are not only welcomed but valued as part of<br>staff professional learning. Instructional coaches align their awareness of<br>school improvement initiatives to support the following: collaborative<br>learning team leads, design and facilitate Professional learning using<br>Benchmark curriculum, facilitated planning sessions with individual teachers<br>and grade levels after school, facilitation of planning events for effective<br>instructional strategies related to core content areas, student engagement,<br>and critical content; team and teacher goal setting through using summative<br>and formative data; provide the Coaching Cycle as it is intended using Jim<br>Knight's model to demonstrate lessons or segments of lessons to teachers,<br>side by side teaching and provide feedback after observing. |
| McNair,<br>LaShawnda  | Instructional<br>Coach | The role of the instructional coach is essential to school improvement for JD<br>Parker Elementary. In a creative hybrid model, each teacher is in the<br>classroom teaching 1/2 of the day and the other 1/2 of the day providing<br>instructional coaching to expand the potential and impact of professional<br>learning. The creative coaching model provides more concentration to<br>specific grade-level teams and teachers to enhance their instructional<br>practices. Data collected through quarterly feedback obtained by teachers<br>suggests instructional coaches are not only welcomed but valued as part of<br>staff professional learning. Instructional coaches align their awareness of<br>school improvement initiatives to support the following: collaborative   |

| Name                | Position<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|
|                     |                        | learning team leads, design and facilitate Professional learning using<br>mathematics curriculum, facilitated planning sessions with individual<br>teachers and grade levels after school, facilitation of planning events for<br>effective instructional strategies related to core content areas, student<br>engagement, and critical content; team and teacher goal setting through<br>using summative and formative data; provide the Coaching Cycle as it is<br>intended using Jim Knight's model to demonstrate lessons or segments of<br>lessons to teachers, side by side teaching and provide feedback after<br>observing.   |
| Roberts,<br>Danelle | Instructional<br>Coach | The role of the instructional coach is essential to school improvement for JD Parker Elementary. In a creative hybrid model, each teacher is in the classroom teaching 1/2 of the day and the other 1/2 of the day providing instructional coaching to expand the potential and impact of professional learning. The creative coaching model provides more concentration to specific grade-level teams and teachers to enhance their instructional practices. Data collected through quarterly feedback obtained by teachers suggests instructional coaches are not only welcomed but valued as part of staff professional learning. Instructional coaches align their awareness of school improvement initiatives to support the following: collaborative learning team leads, design and facilitate Professional learning using mathematics curriculum, facilitated planning sessions with individual teachers and grade levels after school, facilitation of planning events for effective instructional strategies related to core content areas, student engagement, and critical content; team and teacher goal setting through using summative and formative data; provide the Coaching Cycle as it is intended using Jim Knight's model to demonstrate lessons or segments of lessons to teachers, side by side teaching and provide feedback after observing.  |
| Stout,<br>Suzanne   | Instructional<br>Coach | The role of the instructional coach is essential to school improvement for JD Parker Elementary. In a creative hybrid model, each teacher is in the classroom teaching 1/2 of the day and the other 1/2 of the day providing instructional coaching to expand the potential and impact of professional learning. The creative coaching model provides more concentration to specific grade-level teams and teachers as they enhance their instructional practices. Data collected through quarterly feedback obtained by teachers suggests instructional coaches are not only welcomed but valued as part of staff professional learning. Instructional coaches align their awareness of school improvement initiatives to support the following: collaborative learning team leads, design and facilitate Professional learning using science curriculum, facilitated planning sessions with individual teachers and grade levels after school, facilitation of planning events for effective instructional strategies related to core content areas, student engagement, and critical content; team and teacher goal setting through using summative and formative data; provide the Coaching Cycle as it is intended using Jim Knight's model to demonstrate lessons or segments of lessons to teachers, side by side teaching and provide feedback after observing. |

| Name               | Position<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|--------------------|------------------------|--|
| Rathnaw,<br>Nicole | Principal              | My role as Principal is to support the mission and vision outlined in the<br>School Improvement Plan. I will model and design the structures to monitor<br>instructional practices and student outcomes; providing guidance, direction,<br>and feedback to all stakeholders. Adult learning and student learning are<br>the business. Professional learning is not only prioritized but monitored and<br>followed through with consistency and clarity.<br>Student data is the center point for all problem-solving and action planning<br>conversations. Also, the role of the Principal is to support a positive and<br>effective school climate that is safe, cooperative, and collaborative to all<br>students, staff, and families. The role also calls for identifying and cultivating<br>instructional leadership opportunities among staff members. Multiplying<br>leadership roles within instructional staff will enable teachers to learn and<br>teach at their best. |
| White,<br>Shameeka | Assistant<br>Principal | My role as the assistant principal is to support the mission and vision of the school. I follow the direction of the principal to ensure the leadership team and school are collaborating and following through with the established plan. I provide instructional support, assist with data-based decisions, maintain effective communication, and develop strong partnerships with all stakeholders. Also, supervise the school-wide implementation of PBIS.   |
| Gallo,<br>Emily    | School<br>Counselor    | Support school improvement efforts working directly with social-emotional learning supports.   |

#### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 9/21/2021, Melissa Riviotta

```
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.
```

4

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.

8

#### Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

**Total number of students enrolled at the school** 584

#### Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year. 2

**Demographic Data** 

#### Early Warning Systems

#### 2021-22

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |     |    |    |    |     |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|--|-------------|-----|----|----|----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator  | κ           | 1   | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 90          | 101 | 89 | 89 | 88 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 567   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 42          | 37  | 26 | 30 | 21 | 26  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 182   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0  | 30 | 11 | 21  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 62    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0  | 45 | 35 | 39  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 119   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 24          | 43  | 45 | 48 | 48 | 75  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 283   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

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

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/27/2021

#### 2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Martin - 0051 - J. D. Parker School Of Techn | nology - 2021-22 SIP |
|--|----------------------|
|--|----------------------|

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |    |    |    |     |     |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                                 | κ           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtar |
| Number of students enrolled               | 93          | 89 | 90 | 95 | 117 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 591   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 20          | 14 | 24 | 13 | 19  | 17  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 107   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11  | 21  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9   | 20  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29    |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |    |    | G  | Grad | e L | eve | el |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|----|----|----|------|-----|-----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                            | κ | 1 | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5    | 6   | 7   | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | lotal |
| Students with two or more indicators | 9 | 5 | 14 | 11 | 20 | 21   | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 80    |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| In diastan                          |   |   |    |   | C  | Gra | de | Lev | el |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|----|---|----|-----|----|-----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                           | κ | 1 | 2  | 3 | 4  | 5   | 6  | 7   | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 13 | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 1   | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

#### 2020-21 - Updated

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

|   |    |    |    |    | Gr  | ade L | .ev | el |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|---|----|----|----|----|-----|-------|-----|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                                 | к  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4   | 5     | 6   | 7  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled               | 93 | 89 | 90 | 95 | 117 | 107   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 591   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 20 | 14 | 24 | 13 | 19  | 17    | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 107   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0     | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0     | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0     | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11  | 21    | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9   | 20    | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29    |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |    |    | G  | Grad | e L | eve | el |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|----|----|----|------|-----|-----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | κ | 1 | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5    | 6   | 7   | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| Students with two or more indicators | 9 | 5 | 14 | 11 | 20 | 21   | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 80    |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indiantar                           |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | evel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                           | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8    | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0   | 0    | 0    | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0   | 0    | 0    | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

#### Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

#### School Data Review

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      |        | 2021     |       |        | 2019     |       |        | 2018     |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 43%    | 58%      | 57%   | 53%    | 59%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 46%    | 59%      | 58%   | 55%    | 57%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 45%    | 56%      | 53%   | 45%    | 49%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 54%    | 65%      | 63%   | 60%    | 66%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 62%    | 65%      | 62%   | 63%    | 59%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 59%    | 53%      | 51%   | 47%    | 43%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 49%    | 58%      | 53%   | 49%    | 59%      | 55%   |

#### Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03        | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 42%    | 54%      | -12%                              | 58%   | -16%                           |
| Cohort Co | mparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04        | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 35%    | 57%      | -22%                              | 58%   | -23%                           |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -42%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05        | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 46%    | 55%      | -9%                               | 56%   | -10%                           |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -35%   |          |                                   | · ·   |                                |

|            |          |        | MATH     | 4                                 |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 51%    | 58%      | -7%                               | 62%   | -11%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

|            |          |        | MATH     | 1                                 |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
|            | 2019     | 51%    | 67%      | -16%                              | 64%   | -13%                           |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | -51%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 56%    | 64%      | -8%                               | 60%   | -4%                            |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | -51%   |          |                                   | · ·   |                                |

|             |          |        | SCIEN    | CE                                |       |                                |
|-------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade       | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05          | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|             | 2019     | 48%    | 53%      | -5%                               | 53%   | -5%                            |
| Cohort Corr | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

#### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

#### Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Kindergarten: FLKRS-Determine readiness for kindergarten; used to calculate VPK Provider Kindergarten Readiness Rates; Interim Benchmark Assessment; iready Math Diagnostic. Also, as part of more regular progress monitoring, Benchmark Unit Assessments, FUNdations assessments. 1st and 2nd grade: Interim Benchmark Assessment; iready Math Diagnostic. Also, as part of more regular progress monitoring, Benchmark Unit Assessments, FUNdations assessments. 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade: Interim Benchmark Assessment; iready Math Diagnostic. Also, as part of more regular progress monitoring, Benchmark Assessment; iready Math Diagnostic. Also, as part of more regular progress monitoring, Benchmark Assessment; iready Math Diagnostic. Also, as part of more regular progress monitoring, Benchmark Unit Assessment; iready Math Diagnostic. Also, as part of more

|                          |                               | Grade 1 |        |        |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                  | 17      | 29     | 46     |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 14      | 26     | 42     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 17      | 24     | 39     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 8       | 16     | 30     |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                  | 11      | 22     | 45     |
| Mathematics              | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 10      | 18     | 41     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 18      | 23     | 42     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 7       | 15     | 34     |

|                          |   | Grade 2                                 |                                     |                                      |
|--------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency   | Fall                                    | Winter                              | Spring                               |
|                          | All Students  | 20                                      | 30                                  | 46                                   |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically<br>Disadvantaged   | 15                                      | 24                                  | 39                                   |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities   | 19                                      | 25                                  | 33                                   |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 9                                       | 18                                  | 36                                   |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency   | Fall                                    | Winter                              | Spring                               |
|                          | All Students  | 13                                      | 24                                  | 45                                   |
| Mathematics              | Economically<br>Disadvantaged   | 10                                      | 17                                  | 39                                   |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities   | 16                                      | 23                                  | 35                                   |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 9                                       | 18                                  | 36                                   |
|                          |   |   |                                     |                                      |
|                          |   | Grade 3                                 |                                     |                                      |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency   | Grade 3<br>Fall                         | Winter                              | Spring                               |
|                          | Proficiency<br>All Students   |   | Winter<br>18                        | Spring<br>29                         |
| English Language<br>Arts | Proficiency<br>All Students<br>Economically<br>Disadvantaged  | Fall                                    |                                     |                                      |
|                          | Proficiency<br>All Students<br>Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students With<br>Disabilities   | Fall<br>12                              | 18                                  | 29                                   |
|                          | Proficiency<br>All Students<br>Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students With<br>Disabilities<br>English Language<br>Learners   | Fall<br>12<br>9                         | 18<br>14                            | 29<br>25                             |
|                          | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency   | Fall<br>12<br>9<br>11<br>3<br>Fall      | 18<br>14<br>13<br>9<br>Winter       | 29<br>25<br>17<br>19<br>Spring       |
|                          | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students                            | Fall<br>12<br>9<br>11<br>3              | 18<br>14<br>13<br>9                 | 29<br>25<br>17<br>19                 |
|                          | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall<br>12<br>9<br>11<br>3<br>Fall      | 18<br>14<br>13<br>9<br>Winter       | 29<br>25<br>17<br>19<br>Spring       |
| Arts                     | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically               | Fall<br>12<br>9<br>11<br>3<br>Fall<br>9 | 18<br>14<br>13<br>9<br>Winter<br>18 | 29<br>25<br>17<br>19<br>Spring<br>38 |

|                          |                               | Grade 4 |        |        |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%                      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | Proficiency<br>All Students   | 23      | 32     | 44     |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 15      | 22     | 32     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 33      | 37     | 41     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 10      | 19     | 29     |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                  | 16      | 29     | 49     |
| Mathematics              | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 11      | 19     | 40     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 14      | 40     | 46     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 17      | 25     | 43     |
|                          |                               | Grade 5 |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                  | 25      | 33     | 44     |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 15      | 21     | 30     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 40      | 43     | 47     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 16      | 20     | 31     |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                  | 24      | 36     | 56     |
| Mathematics              | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 17      | 25     | 46     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 33      | 47     | 57     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 22      | 36     | 55     |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                  | 27      | 27     | 27     |
| Science                  | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 15      | 16     | 15     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 38      | 48     | 38     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 30      | 21     | 30     |

#### Subgroup Data Review

|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 27          | 56        |                   | 25           | 44         |                    | 40          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 41          | 53        |                   | 42           | 52         |                    | 39          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 14          | 44        | 43                | 14           | 19         | 30                 | 14          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 42          | 55        |                   | 44           | 46         |                    | 45          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 54          |           |                   | 31           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 58          | 59        |                   | 58           | 44         |                    | 72          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 28          | 45        | 50                | 31           | 30         | 42                 | 33          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 28          | 33        | 29                | 48           | 52         | 45                 | 43          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 29          | 38        | 33                | 56           | 65         | 67                 | 41          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 23          | 40        | 47                | 38           | 64         | 61                 | 33          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 37          | 34        | 31                | 56           | 62         | 61                 | 41          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 60          |           |                   | 60           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 63          | 59        |                   | 64           | 60         |                    | 65          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 35          | 47        | 50                | 48           | 58         | 58                 | 45          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2018      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          | ·                       |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2016-17 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2016-17 |
| SWD       | 30          | 42        | 35                | 31           | 44         | 33                 | 33          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 46          | 59        | 55                | 56           | 49         | 47                 |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 27          | 34        | 33                | 32           | 42         | 41                 | 17          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 52          | 60        | 54                | 60           | 57         | 43                 | 38          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 50          |           |                   | 60           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 69          | 62        | 40                | 75           | 79         | 64                 | 67          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 53          | 55        | 45                | 60           | 63         | 47                 | 48          |            |              |                         |                           |

#### ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 45  |
| 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 | 44  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 362 |

| ESSA Federal Index   |          |
|--|----------|
| Total Components for the Federal Index   | 8        |
| Percent Tested   | 99%      |
| Subgroup Data  |          |
| Students With Disabilities   |          |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 41       |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | NO       |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      |          |
| English Language Learners  |          |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 45       |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO       |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       |          |
| 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%        |          |
| 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%                  |          |
| Black/African American Students  |          |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 25       |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES      |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |          |
| Hispanic Students  |          |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 46       |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO       |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |          |
| Multiracial Students   | <u>_</u> |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 43       |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO       |

| Multiracial Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                |     |
| 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%           |     |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 58  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 38  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

#### Analysis

#### **Data Analysis**

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The 2021 data indicates that 41% or 113 of 279 were proficient in ELA. The 2019 reporting score represented a decline in performance data in the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades. Compared to the state, like schools, and district averages, JDP performance data is below the average. Literacy is a critical skill to access other content areas.

# What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest need for improvement in literacy for all students, explicitly monitoring students with disabilities and black students. The focus is on core instruction to support all students, including our black students, and specific attention is planned to support the performance of our students with disabilities.

# What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Both proficiency and learning gains showed the most significant decline from 2018 and continuing through the COVID19 impact. Factors such as core resources and COVID19 contributed to ELA being the lowest component and associated with the decrease in performance in ELA, Math, and Science. JDP's high mobility rate is an additional factor that contributes to our score variance from year to year. Attendance has been a concern because students miss a substantial amount of school

due to illness or quarantine. Data support achievement gaps are present in students with disabilities and black students. The new Benchmark Advance curriculum resources are aligned with the standards and provide streamlined, explicit instruction to maintain the rigor of the high expectations for student learning. Benchmark Advance will provide equity in resources for our students. The attendance committee will problem-solve interventions to increase student attendance with support from district social services support.

# What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Learning gains for the students considered bottom quartile showed the most improvement in both ELA and Math. Using data, students were identified to receive tiered intervention in literacy and mathematics. Identified students were provided intensive research/evidence-based interventions in targetted academic areas as determined by their reading and math performance. Pre and post-tests were administered to assess their progress between formal diagnostics. FSA learning growth and bottom quartile reports suggest effective problem-solving. Still, the students needing tiered intervention faded to independence based on progress monitoring data and FSA learning growth.

# What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our staff has embraced the newly adopted ELA curriculum, Benchmark Literacy, which explicitly provides resources for core instruction. The curriculum is aligned to the BEST standards and provides rigor to grade-level expectations. The Benchmark resource will promote equity of learning across the school in each grade level classroom. Our staff continues to expand our method of providing prescriptive instruction to meet each student in interventions and differentiated instruction. Benchmark Advance intervention resources are aligned to core instruction and used to differentiate instruction- strategically designing small group instruction and tiered intervention. Our school has developed targeted after-school tutoring opportunities to support achievement gaps for our learners. Instructional supports to target skill deficits will be provided to our students identified as students with disabilities, black, and in the bottom quartile. Our attendance team is reaching out to students and families to encourage regular attendance and a system to keep students on target to return to school on time to return to school after being quarantined or isolated due to COVID-19. The school leadership team has a priority focus to monitor the implementation of the Benchmark Advanced Curriculum and to maintain high expectations for student learning. Collaborative Learning teams are planning units using the backward planning model to focus on critical content.

#### What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Our school leadership team has indicated four research-based instructional practices: formative assessment to track student progress, organizing students to interact with content, communicating high expectations to close the achievement gap, and identifying critical content from the standards to provide rigorous instruction in every classroom.

Our school is focused on the implementation of the Benchmark Literacy program for core instruction. Our leadership team prioritizes reviewing data together, identifying strength and growth opportunities, and providing clear guidance on the next steps for students who need additional support and those in need of enrichment.

Collaborative Learning Teams, or CLTs, are the foundation of our school's success. CLTs provide a way to organize our school to meet the needs of all students.

The principal has a strong literacy leadership team that represents each grade level as collaborative team leads (CLT) Team Lead this year. CLTs are the vehicle to School Improvement Efforts, set the standard for professional learning and growth mindset, prepare to LEAD CLTs beforehand and give plenty of time for teams to review and design so as not to waste time during CLTs including standards to best prepare for differentiated instruction. CLT team leads oversees the plan, establishes roles and

responsibilities and the expectations to keep CLT time prioritizing the focus standards and the scales before the meeting to focus on CFAs, data, and response to data going, engage in regular learning walks, and are a liaison for communication for staff and team needs.

# Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional learning opportunities are planned around student formative and summative data, input from teachers, classroom learning walks, high expectations, critical content, formative assessment, organizing students for small group instruction.

Professional learning experiences include CLTs (at a minimum of 2 times weekly); Instructional Coaching supports, Instructional coaches design and facilitate Professional learning using Benchmark curriculum, facilitated planning sessions with individual teachers and grade levels after school, include planning for effective instructional strategies related to literacy, student engagement, and critical content; team and teacher goal setting through using summative and formative data; provide the Coaching Cycle.

Monthly, professional learning events are scheduled with topics collected from CLT discussions, classroom walk-throughs, and data review.

# Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

All have been provided in the description.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| #1 Instructio  | onal Practice specifically relating to Math   |
|--|---|
| Area of<br>Focus<br>Description<br>and                 | Math is an area of focus for our school improvement because 280 students were assessed, and only 40% or 112 students were proficient in mathematics for grades 3, 4, and 5 in 202, and in 2019 54% of the students were proficient.   |
| Rationale:   |   |
| Measurable<br>Outcome:                                 | Based on the baseline data from 2019, FSA Math data for grades 3rd, 4th, and 5th for the 2021/2022 school year will report 59% mathematics proficiency.<br>By June 2022, 57% of all students will be at or above learning expectations according to the Spring, final iReady math diagnostic, an increase of 5% from spring 2021.   |
| Monitoring:  | Mathematics will be progressed monitored using i-ready math diagnostic assessment, iSMs, and curriculum/CLT formative data.   |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome: | Danelle Roberts (robertd3@martinschools.org)  |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:                        | Implement at the Core for all students: Go Math; iReady lessons, Math in Practice; Number Talks, as observed through classroom walk-throughs, quarterly data chats with coaches and teachers, and weekly collaboratively planning sessions.   |
|  | With a focus on using data to determine prescriptive next steps for each student, collaborative planning sessions and data chats will focus on the organization of small group instruction. The resource to support small group instruction is Mindset Math, which supports learning foundational mathematical skills, assigned iready instruction lessons, and guided math.  |
|  | Instructional Coaching supports: Focused Professional Learning around four high impact<br>strategies: Tracking and monitoring with formative assessments; Using and providing high<br>expectations; a critical content focus and organizing students to interact with content.<br>Professional learning opportunities are planned around student formative and summative<br>data, input from teachers, classroom learning walks, high expectations, critical content,<br>formative assessment, organizing students for small group instruction.   |
|  | Professional learning experiences include CLTs (at a minimum of 2 times weekly);<br>Instructional Coaching supports, Instructional coaches design and facilitate Professional<br>learning using mathematics curriculum, math in practice, guided math, mindset math, and<br>item aspects to facilitate planning sessions with individual teachers and grade levels after<br>school, include planning for effective instructional strategies related to mathematics,<br>student engagement, and critical content; team and teacher goal setting through using<br>summative and formative data; provide the Coaching Cycle. |
|  | Monthly, professional learning events are scheduled with topics including student<br>engagement, benchmark assessment platform, editing and revising knowledge, vocabulary<br>strategies, CUBES math strategy, use of formative data to determine instructional steps,<br>organizing small group instruction, high expectations for student learning to close the<br>achievement gap, identify the critical content of the standards.   |
| Rationale<br>for<br>Evidence-                          | All strategies included in this plan are evidence-based and research-based.   |

#### based Strategy:

#### Action Steps to Implement

Collective walk-through classroom tool to be used by the administration, coaches, and teachers. A partnership between Danelle Roberts and McNair is responsible for this action step.

#### Person

Responsible Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us)

Instructional Coaching support weekly CLTs. A partnership between Danelle Roberts and McNair is responsible for this action step.

#### Person Responsible Danelle Roberts (robertd3@martinschools.org)

They have prescribed a coaching cycle for new to the teaching profession, new to the grade level, teachers seeking growth in a specific area, or teachers needing additional support. A partnership between Danelle Roberts and McNair is responsible for this action step.

#### Person

Responsible Danelle Roberts (robertd3@martinschools.org)

Instructional coaches collect, analyze, and make instructional recommendations to the administration during leadership meetings. A partnership between Danelle Roberts and McNair is responsible for this action step.

#### Person Responsible

Danelle Roberts (robertd3@martinschools.org)

Quarterly data conversations between administration, coaches, and teachers. A partnership between Danelle Roberts and McNair is responsible for this action step.

#### Person

Responsible Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us)

Designed intervention and small group instruction to respond to areas of growth for students. A partnership between Danelle Roberts and McNair is responsible for this action step.

#### Person

Responsible Danelle Roberts (robertd3@martinschools.org)

Professional development and follow-up look-for in academic priorities for high expectations, critical content, formative data, and organizing students to learn

#### Person

Responsible Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us)

Just in time, professional development opportunities for certain teachers based on fidelity walks for mathematics curriculum and academic priorities. A partnership between Danelle Roberts and McNair is responsible for this action step.

Person Responsible Danelle Roberts (robertd3@martinschools.org)

#### **#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

| # <b>2</b> . III3ti dotto                              | har Fractice specifically relating to Science  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Area of<br>Focus<br>Description<br>and<br>Rationale:   | 42 of the 95, 44%, students assessed on the 5th grade FSA Science were proficient in 202 and 49% proficient in 2019.   |  |  |  |
| Measurable<br>Outcome:                                 | Goal: By June of 2022, the number of students across all subgroups in 5th grade demonstrating Science proficiency will increase to 54%.  |  |  |  |
| Monitoring:  | Science will be monitored through the Formative Assessment outlined by the curriculum department and teacher-created formatives during CLTs.   |  |  |  |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome: | Suzanne Stout (stouts@martinschools.org)   |  |  |  |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:                        | Pearson/Savvas Elevate Science text<br>Differentiated instruction strategies<br>Science Bootcamp Curriculum including Daily Practice Drills (5th grade only)<br>Hands-on learning through experiments<br>Data focused conversations<br>District Science Coordinator to help with instructional strategies<br>Professional learning opportunities are planned around student formative and summative<br>data, input from teachers, classroom learning walks, high expectations, critical content,<br>formative assessment, organizing students for small group instruction.<br>Professional learning experiences include CLTs (at a minimum of 2 times weekly);<br>Instructional Coaching supports, Instructional coaches design and facilitate Professional<br>learning using mathematics curriculum, math in practice, guided math, mindset math, and<br>item aspects to facilitate planning sessions with individual teachers and grade levels after<br>school, include planning for effective instructional strategies related to mathematics,<br>student engagement, and critical content; team and teacher goal setting through using<br>summative and formative data; provide the Coaching Cycle.<br>Monthly, professional learning events are scheduled with topics including student<br>engagement, benchmark assessment platform, editing and revising knowledge, vocabulary<br>strategies, CUBES math strategy, use of formative data to determine instructional steps,<br>organizing small group instruction, high expectations for student learning to close the<br>achievement gap, identify the critical content of the standards. |  |  |  |
| Rationale<br>for<br>Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:    | A hands-on approach to learning science builds students' backgrounds and is engaging.<br>The vocabulary highlighted in the new Benchmark program supports the background<br>information for students in science.   |  |  |  |
| Action Steps   | to Implement   |  |  |  |
| Collective wal   | k-through classroom tool to be used by the administration, coaches, and teachers.  |  |  |  |
| Person<br>Responsible                                  |  |  |  |  |
| Instructional Coaching support weekly CLTs.            |  |  |  |  |

Instructional Coaching support weekly CLTs.

#### Person Suzanne Stout (stouts@martinschools.org) Responsible

They prescribed a coaching cycle for new to the teaching profession, new to the grade level, teachers seeking growth in a specific area, or teachers needing additional support.

#### Person

Suzanne Stout (stouts@martinschools.org) Responsible

Instructional coaches collect, analyze, and make instructional recommendations to the administration during leadership meetings.

#### Person

Suzanne Stout (stouts@martinschools.org) Responsible

Quarterly data conversations between administration, coaches, and teachers.

Person [no one identified] Responsible

Targeted small group instruction designed around CFAs.

#### Person Suzanne Stout (stouts@martinschools.org) Responsible

Professional development and follow-up look-for in academic priorities for high expectations, critical content, formative data, and organizing students to learn

#### Person

Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us) Responsible

Just in time, professional development opportunities for certain teachers based on fidelity walks for benchmark and academic priorities.

#### Person

Suzanne Stout (stouts@martinschools.org) Responsible

| #3. Instructio   | nal Practice specifically relating to ELA   |
|--|---|
| Area of  |   |
| Focus<br>Description<br>and<br>Rationale:              | 113 of 279 students assessed on the FSA for 2021 were reported proficient in grades 3rd, 4th, and 5th, with an overall proficiency average of 41%.  |
| Rationale.   | Overall eccentrics to the ECA students will perform at 400/ preficiency o E0/ increases from  |
| Measurable<br>Outcome:                                 | Overall, according to the FSA, students will perform at 48% proficiency, a 5% increase from previous 2019 FSA data.   |
| Monitoring:  | By June 2022, JDP students will score 80% on Benchmark Interim 4 Assessment. This number is representative of a 20% increase across all students. (Average for Benchmark Interim 1 Assessment=38%)  |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome: | Jessica Addorisio (addorij@martin.k12.fl.us)  |
| Evidence-  | With a focus on using data to determine prescriptive next steps for each student, collaborative planning sessions and data chats will focus on the organization of small group instruction. The resource to support small group instruction Benchmark Intervention, reteach of the student notebook/workbook, and the blueprint.  |
|  | Instructional Coaching supports- see description in school information: Focused<br>Professional Learning around four high impact strategies: Tracking and monitoring with<br>formative assessments; Using and providing high expectations; a critical content focus and<br>organizing students to interact with content. Professional learning opportunities are planned<br>around student formative and summative data, input from teachers, classroom learning<br>walks, high expectations, critical content, formative assessment, organizing students for<br>small group instruction. |
| based<br>Strategy:                                     | Professional learning experiences include CLTs (at a minimum of 2 times weekly);<br>Instructional Coaching supports, Instructional coaches design and facilitate Professional<br>learning using Benchmark curriculum, facilitated planning sessions with individual teachers<br>and grade levels after school, include planning for effective instructional strategies related<br>to mathematics, student engagement, and critical content; team and teacher goal setting<br>through using summative and formative data; provide the Coaching Cycle.                                      |
|  | Monthly, professional learning events are scheduled with topics including student<br>engagement, benchmark assessment platform, editing and revising knowledge, vocabulary<br>strategies, use of formative data to determine instructional steps, organizing small group<br>instruction, high expectations for student learning to close the achievement gap, identify the<br>critical content of the standards.  |
| Rationale<br>for<br>Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:    | The greatest need for improvement at JD Parker Elementary is literacy for all students.   |
| Action Steps   | to Implement  |

Collective walk-through classroom tool, provided by the district for Benchmark Advanced, to be used by the administration, coaches, and teachers.

#### Person Responsible Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us)

Instructional Coaching support weekly CLTs. Both Jessica Addorisio and Jamie Hawkins are responsible for the implementation of this action step.

#### Person

Responsible Jessica Addorisio (addorij@martin.k12.fl.us)

They prescribed a coaching cycle for new to the teaching profession, new to the grade level, teachers seeking growth in a specific area, or teachers needing additional support. Both Jessica Addorisio and Jamie Hawkins are responsible for the implementation of this action step.

Person Jessica Addorisio (addorij@martin.k12.fl.us)

Instructional coaches collect, analyze, and make instructional recommendations to the administration during leadership meetings. Both Jessica Addorisio and Jamie Hawkins are responsible for the implementation of this action step.

#### Person

Responsible Jessica Addorisio (addorij@martin.k12.fl.us)

Professional development in academic priorities for high expectations, critical content, formative data, and learning organizing students.

Person Responsible Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us)

Just in time, professional development opportunities for certain teachers based on fidelity walks for benchmark and academic priorities. Both Jessica Addorisio and Jamie Hawkins are responsible for the implementation of this action step.

#### Person

**Responsible** Jessica Addorisio (addorij@martin.k12.fl.us)

| #4. Instructio   | onal Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction   |
|--|--|
| Area of<br>Focus<br>Description<br>and<br>Rationale:   | Deliberate planning for small group instruction and intervention is a priority to ensure we accurately determine the academic needs, appropriate resources for curriculum for both literacy and mathematics.   |
| Measurable<br>Outcome:                                 | The learning gains for students in literacy will increase from 54% from 2021 to 59% for 2022.  |
| Monitoring:  | By June 2022, all K-5 students receiving Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions will have a positive response to intervention. Easy CBM will be used to make informed decisions on response to intervention. Built-in common formative assessments designed by the CLT teams will monitor the effectiveness of remediation.  |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome: | Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us)   |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:                        | Intervention materials listed on MCSD's Reading Plan Decision Tree<br>JDP MTSS Leadership Meetings weekly<br>Master Schedule developed with daily, whole-school intervention time<br>Staff professional learning opportunities<br>Student Concern Form developed and distributed to teachers<br>Activate area experts at District Office when needed<br>Intervention fidelity Walks<br>Small group instruction with progress monitoring using EasyCBM. Student data will be<br>monitored by the teacher weekly and the MTSS Leadership Team every 4 weeks for Tier 2<br>students and every 2 weeks for Tier 3 students.<br>Using data to identify students struggling with fundamental skills, students will be hand-<br>selected for after-school tutoring for literacy, math, and science.<br>Bottom Quartile students receive core instruction, differentiated instruction with the teacher,<br>and tiered intervention with an intervention teacher. |
| Rationale<br>for<br>Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:    | Deliberate planning for instruction for remediation and regular progress monitoring of our students that have learning gaps will increase the learning rate to close the gap for our most vulnerable students.   |

#### Action Steps to Implement

In partnership with instructional coaches, CLTs, and individual teachers per coaching notes, small group instruction for reteaching, enrichment, and intervention will be prescribed using aligned resources and progress monitoring.

Jessica Addorisio, Danelle Roberts, LaShawnda McNair, Suzanne Stout, and Jamie Hawkins are responsible for the implementation of this action step.

#### Person

Responsible Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us)

Collective walk-through classroom tool to be used by the administration, coaches, and teachers. Both Jessica Addorisio and Jamie Hawkins are responsible for the implementation of this action step. Jessica Addorisio, Danelle Roberts, LaShawnda McNair, Suzanne Stout, and Jamie Hawkins are responsible for the implementation of this action step.

#### Person Jessica Addorisio (addorij@martin.k12.fl.us)

Instructional Coaching support weekly CLTs in the development of small group instruction. Jessica Addorisio, Danelle Roberts, LaShawnda McNair, Suzanne Stout, and Jamie Hawkins are responsible for the implementation of this action step.

#### Person

Responsible Danelle Roberts (robertd3@martinschools.org)

After-school tutoring opportunities will be created for students identified in our bottom quartile and below the progress criteria in the reading plan (interim and unit assessment data between 40%-59% for supplemental instruction and intensive instruction 0-39%). Jessica Addorisio, Danelle Roberts, LaShawnda McNair, Suzanne Stout, and Jamie Hawkins are responsible for the implementation of this action step.

#### Person

Responsible Danelle Roberts (robertd3@martinschools.org)

Professional development and follow-up look-for in academic priorities for high expectations, critical content, formative data, and organizing students to learn

Person

Responsible Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us)

#### **#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

| Area of<br>Focus<br>Description<br>and<br>Rationale:   | ESSA has identified SWDs as an area of concern. The students are not performing to expectations compared to their cohort.  |
|--|--|
| Measurable<br>Outcome:                                 | JDP has a FIRE (Federal Index Reporting for Equity) that states show all students in tested grade levels, designated ESE status, are performing under the expectation below the 41% proficiency on state assessments   |
| Monitoring:  | FSA data 2022  |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome: | Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us)   |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:                        | Strategic Scheduling; Collaborative teaching model and planning for effective instruction;<br>IEP Goal Setting<br>Flexible Grouping; Strategic Scheduling-Master Schedule to align resources to support<br>student learning. Strategically schedule personnel to support students based on needs.<br>Collaborative teaching model to provide more prescriptive specialized instruction for social<br>and emotional learning, as well as academics and<br>independent functioning.<br>Goal development will be made in partnership with the student and the IEP<br>team. Goals will be relative to the students learning and achievable.  |
| Rationale<br>for<br>Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:    | It is expected that ESE teachers are working in conjunction with Gen. Ed. teachers in small<br>group instruction following the schedule. This would require planning time- attending CLTs<br>will help with the planning time. The expectations:<br>*Follow the master schedule and the daily schedule.<br>*Use curriculum Benchmark/Go Math/My Math, Benchmark Intervention/GO Math Reteach<br>and My Math *Reteach, Mindset Math, SPIRE/Sounds Sensible (if called for), reteach small<br>groups to skills as determined through planning.<br>*Math Basic Number sense<br>* FUNdations reteach<br>*Use SPIRE/Sound Sensible when it is called for according to the IEP or student needs.<br>*During classroom instruction, each teacher has their role and is planned for instruction<br>with resources and an understanding of the content.<br>*ESE students must meet with Gen. Ed. teachers<br>*Active instruction is occurring- not over the shoulder watching, on the phone, social |
|  | support, etc. Planned active instruction.  |
| Outcome:   | grade levels, designated ESE status, are performing under the expectation below the 41% proficiency on state assessments   |
| Description<br>and<br>Rationale:<br>Measurable         | expectations compared to their cohort.<br>JDP has a FIRE (Federal Index Reporting for Equity) that states show all students in tested grade levels, designated ESE status, are performing under the expectation below the 41%  |
| Description and  |  |
|  | ESSA bas identified SW/Ds as an area of sonsars. The students are not performing to  |

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

In partnership with instructional coaches, CLTs, and individual teachers per coaching notes, small group instruction for reteaching, enrichment, and intervention will be prescribed using aligned resources and progress monitoring.

All coaches are responsible for their focus area. Jessica Addorisio, Danelle Roberts, LaShawnda McNair, Suzanne Stout, and Jamie Hawkins are accountable for the implementation of this action step.

Person Responsible Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us) Instructional Coaching supports weekly CLTs to develop small group instruction and targeted tiered intervention. Jessica Addorisio, Danelle Roberts, LaShawnda McNair, Suzanne Stout, and Jamie Hawkins are responsible for the implementation of this action step.

Person Responsible Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us)

| Leadership is focused on the alignment of a robust instructional system to educate all students for success. Our leadership team has established a common understanding of the success of our school. The group is called the Instructional Cabinet, and collectively the team has contributed to the structures necessary for school improvement. |
|--|
| **With a focus on high standards for all students, our leadership team and collaborative   |

Area of teams determine the alignment of the curriculum framework, and if not aligned, they are Focus collaboratively developed. With the support of the coaches, instructional materials are researched and made available for teams to implement. Teams review the formative Description assessments to determine the students' responses to instruction. When a positive and **Rationale:** response is determined, teams plan for enrichment or extension of learning, determined by a need in climate survey both from parents and students. Should a student or a group of students need additional support, together with the leadership team, teachers implement a framework for students in need of targeted intervention. Our team will continue to build out two areas: developing well-designed curriculum frameworks and formative assessments, alongside transparent gateways for students to include intervention and extensions for learning.

The outcome to measure the success of the instructional cabinet will be<br/>reflected in the Satisfaction and Engagement Survey from staff around the<br/>questions: At my school, there is a collaborative culture. The goal is to<br/>increase the staff report from 40% strongly agree to 70%. And the question, I<br/>feel communication from my campus is effective. The goal is to increase the

staff report from 55% strongly agree and agree to 80% strongly agree.

Monitoring: Climate survey

**responsible** for Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us)

monitoring outcome:

Person

It is the role of the school administrator to arrange, activate, and engage staff engagement to enhance the learning conditions for our students. To best establish a practical foundation for learning, professional learning around leadership attributes focused work and dedication to collective accountability will result in positive learning outcomes for our staff and students. Collaborative leadership will share the implementation of initiatives and foster the relationships between adult learners. Rationale

Evidencebased

Strategy:

Strategy:

for

It is not the sole responsibility of the principal for school improvement. Building capacity capable educators and activating their strengths will multiply the efforts throughout the grade levels and classrooms. With this in mind, JDP has expanded its leadership team from 5 to 12 educators. Along with the expansion, leadership development will develop the skills and enhance their strengths to maximize the urgent work to improve the outcomes for all learners.

#### Rationale

for Enhance Collective Efficacy

Evidence-based

Evidence-

#### based Strategy:

#### Action Steps to Implement

All leadership team members will be certified Martin Mentors to expand on clinical education teachers to support aspiring educators and strengthen their leadership skills when working with teams on goal setting, action plan, creating strategies and providing feedback.

The instructional leadership team will: model a growth mindset and coach this mindset in others. (Skill 1) conduct effective content planning conferences. (Skill 2) become expert observers and diagnosticians of teaching and learning. (Skill 3) provide targeted feedback to new teachers about their teaching practices. (Skill 4) through mentoring activities, help to increase the retention rate of new teachers."

#### Person Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us) Responsible

Within each team, a common Collaborative Learning Team Tool will house the tools to collectively construct deliberate planning around power standards through conversations, decision making, and editing when appropriate around the alignment of high standards for all students, well-developed curriculum frameworks, instructional materials, and resources, assessments, supports for students in need of additional instruction and the creation of gateways for students.

## Person

Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us) Responsible

With the Instructional Cabinet, the Instructional Round structure will collectively develop four common learning look-for: critical content from the standards, organizing students to interact with content, using formative assessment and organizing students for learning, and setting high expectations for students learning. This process of learning walks is to sharpen the understanding of the instructional core and enhance active learning among adult learners on campus. This process focuses on objective data collection through observation, analysis, discussion, and collective understanding to devise next steps that are relevant to the learning environment of the Parker campus.

#### Person

Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us) Responsible

Transform classrooms into professional learning labs for all adult learners on campus. All five of our five instructional coaches engineer a classroom for all learners, students, and adults alike. The classrooms are designed to not only support student learning but also as a lab for the coaching cycle for adult learning to occur through the coaching cycle of modeling, observation, collaborative data exploration to enhance the behaviors and skills of educators.

#### Person

Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us)

Responsible Dedicate collaborative planning teams times during the week, with the support of an instructional coach and administrator, to focus on learning and social/emotional expectations, data-focused discussions, and collective action steps to respond to student data. This is from the understanding of Bandura (1997), a group's shared beliefs in its conjoint capabilities to organize and execute." This will support a shared experience of

#### Person

Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us) Responsible

#### Collaborative Data Liaison (CDL), one per grade level

the work to increase student achievement.

Lead to support Collaborative Learning Teams. One per grade level to support the deliberate and prescriptive planning of instruction. The process is similar to the problem-solving process: data analysis, problem identification, plan for action, differentiated instruction for remediation, and extensions for learning. The CDL facilitates conversations

around effective instructional strategies and best practices in the classroom for both academics and social/emotional learning. Also, the CDL collaborates to analyze student performance data relative to the standards to design small group lesson plans to increase student proficiency collectively

#### Person Responsible Nicole Rathnaw (rathnan1@martin.k12.fl.us)

**#7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning** 

| Area of Focus<br>Description and<br>Rationale: | Social and emotional learning (SEL) is the process through which children<br>and<br>adults acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills<br>necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive<br>goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive<br>relationships, and make responsible decisions (CASEL, 2020). SEL has<br>become an area of critical need at JD Parker because since this was made a<br>state requirement last year, the school never received training using an SEL<br>program.   |
|--|--|
| Measurable Outcome:                            | By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, 90% of all teachers will be using all the components of the daily meetup daily in their classrooms  |
| Monitoring:                                    | Monitoring of minor and major ODR  |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome:     | Shameeka White (whites@martin.k12.fl.us)   |
| Evidence-based<br>Strategy:                    | The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning states that<br>when an SEL program or core competencies are incorporated into the<br>learning environment students showed improved classroom behavior, an<br>increased ability to manage stress and depression. Students also have a<br>more positive attitude towards school, others, and themselves.  |
| Rationale for Evidence-<br>based Strategy:     | The school will be implementing the Sanford Harmony SEL program in all grades k-5. This program is district-approved and evidence-based that when done consistently in the classroom, schools have noted increased student engagement, improved school climate, and less disruptive behaviors.   |
| Action Steps to Implement                      | it in the second s |

Teachers will continue to familiarize themselves with the components of Harmony SEL.

Person Responsible Shameeka White (whites@martin.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will create a supportive classroom climate by ensuring all students feel emotionally safe and a part of a community.

Person Responsible Shameeka White (whites@martin.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will incorporate SEL into the current classroom curriculum and help develop a growth mindset.

**Person Responsible** Shameeka White (whites@martin.k12.fl.us)

Lunch Bunch supports with Social Services Support.

**Person Responsible** Shameeka White (whites@martin.k12.fl.us)

#8 Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

|   | forment specifically relating to rositive behavior intervention and oupports   |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus<br>Description and<br>Rationale:      | Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports is an evidence-based multitiered<br>behavioral framework for improving school systems and practices<br>impacting student outcomes. Often teachers struggle with minor<br>classroom management and how to address disruptive behaviors in the<br>classroom. Core PBIS framework requires that schools and teachers create<br>systems to take the stress out of classroom management. This was identified<br>as an area of critical need based on the implementation walkthrough completed last<br>year by the district PBIS coordinator and the benchmarks<br>of quality completed by the school-based team. |
| Measurable<br>Outcome:                              | JD Parker School of Science, Math, and Technology will go from a School of Resiliency award to a Silver Model School award according to the FLPBIS criteria.   |
| Monitoring:   | Decrease in minor and major discipline ODRs  |
| Person<br>responsible for<br>monitoring<br>outcome: | Shameeka White (whites@martin.k12.fl.us)   |
| Evidence-based<br>Strategy:                         | This school year, the PBIS team has problem solved the areas of weakness from last school year and created an action plan. The team has decided to focus on three areas of staff commitment to the program, explicitly teaching the school-wide expectations and overall implementation in the classroom.  |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-based<br>Strategy:        | Schools that have a robust PBIS core system in place will see a reduction in classroom disruptions, improved school climate, and academic achievement. Once expectations are in place and explicitly taught, teachers spend more time on instruction than correcting behavior. The team will use the FLPBIS website and district coach to strengthen our school's core PBIS implementation.  |
| Action Steps to Im                                  | plement  |

The PBIS team will meet once a month and is open to add a teacher from each grade level.

| Person      | Shamaaka White (white @martin k12 fl us) |
|-------------|--|
| Responsible | Shameeka White (whites@martin.k12.fl.us) |

The PBIS team will create weekly, monthly, and quarterly incentives to ensure all students are continuously engaged in the program.

## Person Shameeka White (whites@martin.k12.fl.us)

The PBIS will problem-solve around high problem locations, behaviors, and students to ensure a decrease in office discipline referrals.

| Person      | Shameeka White (whites@martin.k12.fl.us) |
|-------------|--|
| Responsible | Shameeka White (Whites@hattin.k1z.ii.us) |

The PBIS team will meet once a month and is open to add a teacher from each grade level.

#### Person Responsible Shameeka White (whites@martin.k12.fl.us)

The PBIS team will create weekly, monthly, and quarterly incentives to ensure all students are continuously engaged in the program.

# Person Shameeka White (whites@martin.k12.fl.us)

The PBIS will problem-solve around high problem locations, behaviors, and students to ensure a decrease in office discipline referrals.

| Person<br>Responsible                                  | Shameeka White (whites@martin.k12.fl.us)  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| #9. Culture &  | Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance   |  |  |
| Area of<br>Focus<br>Description<br>and<br>Rationale:   | Student Attendance will be another area of schoolwide improvement priority.<br>Students are more likely to succeed in academics when they attend school regularly. This<br>school year, the students are receiving instruction only in person. Over the past two<br>months, we have found that our daily attendance rate has been down compared to years<br>prior due to students being quarantined.                                  |  |  |
| Measurable<br>Outcome:                                 | By the end of 2020-2021, the school year will decrease the number of students absent will be reduced to 10% or more from school by 5% as measured by school data, with a goal of a minimum of 95% attendance for the school year.   |  |  |
| Monitoring:  | weekly attendance reports   |  |  |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome: | Shameeka White (whites@martin.k12.fl.us)  |  |  |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:                        | JD Parker School of Science, Math, and Technology will institute weekly and<br>monthly attendance incentives to decrease absenteeism and<br>tardies. Students will receive attendance "Rock'it Cards" for being on time to<br>class and present daily. Then students will use their attendance cards to<br>receive different incentives throughout the year. We will continue to monitor<br>students' interests and adjust as needed. |  |  |
| Rationale<br>for<br>Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:    | According to research, using incentives becomes most effective when the attendance incentives are a part of the school-wide culture and accompanied by a deep commitment to ensuring students are engaging in the classroom when they show up.  |  |  |
| Action Steps   | to Implement  |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |

The attendance team will hold weekly meetings discussing tier 2 and tier 3 students.

Person Responsible Shameeka White (whites@martin.k12.fl.us)

The attendance team will provide attendance interventions for high-needs students.

Person Responsible Shameeka White (whites@martin.k12.fl.us)

The attendance team will hold parent meetings to help assist the family unit in assisting with barriers.

Person Responsible Shameeka White (whites@martin.k12.fl.us)

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

a. Describe how the school addresses building positive school culture and environment. Over the last four years, JD Parker School of Science, Math, and Technology has reconstructed Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports. During the 2019-2020 school year, the PBIS team participated in extensive training and coaching from the school district Prevention Intervention Program Specialist to help restructure and strengthen Tier 1 Behavior supports. Last school year, the PBIS team began working with the teacher to ensure basic PBIS practices. Teachers were required to have a classroom matrix, predetermined consequences, and rewards implemented in the classroom. We offer teachers de-escalation, classroom management (STOIC), and Social-Emotional Learning professional development this school year. All of the adults at JDP are encouraged to build positive relationships with students and promote positive behaviors.

b. Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Nicole Rathnaw, Principal: Promoting PBIS and SEL campus-wide, Coaching and training all adults in PBIS, offering Professional Development, monitoring minor and major referrals, following progressive discipline outlined in the MCSD Code of Conduct, ensuring fair and equitable consequences, PBIS parent outreach

Shameeka White, Assistant Principal: Promoting PBIS and SEL campus-wide, Coaching and training all adults in PBIS, offering Professional Development, monitoring minor and major referrals, following progressive discipline outlined in the MCSD Code of Conduct, ensuring fair and equitable consequences, PBIS parent outreach

Emily Gallo, School Counselor: Promoting PBIS and SEL campus-wide, Coaching and training all adults in PBIS, PBIS parent outreach

Jodi Wintercorn- Matt Kovach, PBIS team, leads: Promoting PBIS and SEL campus-wide, Coaching and training all adults in PBIS.

Janae Bell, District Social Services Staff: PBIS and SEL campus-wide, Coaching and training all adults in PBIS, PBIS parent outreach

#### 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.

JD Parker School of Science, Math, and Technology is truly a family-oriented community school fully embraced by the community we serve. As a school, we are proud to serve the City of Stuart. During the summer, we partnered with community organizations like the NAACP, Gertrude Walden Early Learning Center, YMCA, and East Stuart Youth Initiative, the Education Foundation of Martin County to provide books and learning materials to our students. Due to the nature of how we started the school year, the school offered a parent town hall for parents to attend and ask questions about the new protocols for the year. According to our climate survey, parents are nearly 90% satisfied overall with JDP and feel that both academics and school operations are effective and learn.

Our school has created a unique relationship with the City of Stuart Police Department. The police department has a yearly barbecue for our teachers the week before we start school. They created "You Got Booked," where teachers can send struggling readers to the library to read with an officer. Our school parent organizations like SAC and PTO meetings are well attended diverse in the parents and community partners. The PTO helps support fun activities for the students throughout the year and does a fantastic job of appreciating our teachers.

Finally, our school parent liaison, school counselor, School Social Service Worker, and administration work hard with district-level support, parents, and teachers to meet the needs of our unique population of students. They also attend many different community events to help strengthen the school and community partnership.

# Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

A focus group will seek to enlist parent input for each of our subgroups so we can have an increase in parent involvement. We have also started parent universities events to obtain more feedback from not only parents but the community. Janea Bell, District Social Services Staff Osmari Rosario, Parent Liasion Emily Gallo, School Counselor School Advisory Council Chair, Erin Kirkwood School Advisory Council per membership and participants Parent-Teacher Organization The community relations of Stuart Police Department The Rocking Horse Foundation

#### Part V: Budget

#### The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| 1  | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math |   |                | \$3,500.00 |            |
|--|----------|--|---|----------------|------------|------------|
|  | Function | Object                                       | Budget Focus                                | Funding Source | FTE        | 2021-22    |
|  | 5100     | 120-Classroom Teachers                       | 0051 - J. D. Parker School Of<br>Technology | Other Federal  |            | \$3,500.00 |
| Notes: Tutoring and BootCamps                            |          |  |   |                |            |            |
| 2 III.A. Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science |          |  | \$500.00                                    |                |            |            |

|  | Function | Object   | Budget Focus  | Funding Source          | FTE    | 2021-22    |
|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|--------|------------|
|  | 5100     | 120-Classroom Teachers   | 0051 - J. D. Parker School Of<br>Technology               | Other Federal           |        | \$500.00   |
|  | •        |  | Notes: 5th Grade Tutoring                                 |                         |        |            |
| 3  | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Instructiona   | I Practice: ELA   |                         |        | \$3,500.00 |
|  | Function | Object   | Budget Focus  | Funding Source          | FTE    | 2021-22    |
|  | 5100     | 120-Classroom Teachers   | 0051 - J. D. Parker School Of<br>Technology               | Other Federal           |        | \$3,500.00 |
| 4  | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction                    |   |                         |        | \$500.00   |
|  | Function | Object   | Budget Focus  | Funding Source          | FTE    | 2021-22    |
|  | 5100     | 500-Materials and Supplies   | 0051 - J. D. Parker School Of<br>Technology               | General Fund            |        | \$500.00   |
|  |          |  | Notes: Supplemental resources for sm                      | nall group instruction. |        |            |
| 5  | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subg  | roup: Students with Disabilition                          | es                      |        | \$0.00     |
| 6  | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Leadership:  | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team |                         |        | \$0.00     |
| 7  | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning                   |   |                         | \$0.00 |            |
| 8  | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports |   |                         | \$0.00 |            |
| 9 III.A. Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance |          |  |   | \$0.00                  |        |            |
|  |          |  |   |                         | Total: | \$8,000.00 |

#### Martin - 0051 - J. D. Parker School Of Technology - 2021-22 SIP