

Martin County School District

Indiantown Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	27
Budget to Support Goals	28

Indiantown Middle School

16303 SW FARM RD, Indiantown, FL 34956

martinschools.org/o/ims

Demographics

Principal: Jeff Raimann

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	28

Indiantown Middle School

16303 SW FARM RD, Indiantown, FL 34956

martinschools.org/o/ims

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">96%</p>

School Grades History

	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Year				
Grade		B	B	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Raimann, Jeff	Principal	
Bickley, William	Assistant Principal	
Norman, Melora	Assistant Principal	
Macedo, Consuelo	Teacher, K-12	Guiding Coalition
Mesorana, Matt	Teacher, K-12	Guiding Coalition
Monks, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	Guiding Coalition
Rivera, Denise	School Counselor	
Young, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Cameron, Kendra	Teacher, K-12	
Farrar, Casi	Teacher, K-12	
Sportsman, Stephanie	School Counselor	
Tuthill, Sarah	Instructional Coach	
Stoner, Katy	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/1/2012, Jeff Raimann

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

8

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

640

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

5

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

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	142	167	170	191	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	47	56	49	61	0	0	0	0	213
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	19	16	23	16	0	0	0	0	74
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	23	29	0	0	0	0	96
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	18	38	0	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	72	52	63	76	0	0	0	0	263
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	69	52	47	52	0	0	0	0	220
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	71	72	66	76	0	0	0	0	285

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	7	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	9	5	0	0	0	0	29

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	133	161	165	183	0	0	0	0	642
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	30	52	44	57	0	0	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	27	30	55	54	0	0	0	0	166
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	30	25	34	43	0	0	0	0	132
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	8	4	0	0	0	0	28

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	133	161	165	183	0	0	0	0	642
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	30	52	44	57	0	0	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	27	30	55	54	0	0	0	0	166
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	30	25	34	43	0	0	0	0	132
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	8	4	0	0	0	0	28

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	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				33%	62%	54%	33%	62%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	58%	54%	44%	60%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	51%	47%	38%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				61%	74%	58%	58%	73%	58%
Math Learning Gains				64%	68%	57%	61%	70%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	55%	51%	49%	57%	51%
Science Achievement				31%	64%	51%	30%	62%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				95%	87%	72%	63%	82%	72%

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-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	27%	57%	-30%	54%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	31%	53%	-22%	52%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
08	2021					
	2019	37%	62%	-25%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	51%	64%	-13%	55%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	55%	60%	-5%	54%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2021					
	2019	50%	67%	-17%	46%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	30%	58%	-28%	48%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	95%	77%	18%	71%	24%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	88%	75%	13%	61%	27%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	95%	65%	30%	57%	38%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

- Grades 5-8 Math & ELA -Adaptive Progress Monitoring (APM);
- Grades 8 Science & Civics - Common Quarterly Assessment (CQA);
- Grade 5 Science - Progress Monitoring Test (PMT)

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	6.63	11.83	20.93
	Economically Disadvantaged	7.35	12.17	22.68
	Students With Disabilities	7.69	4	7.69
	English Language Learners	4.64	11.59	18.77
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8.33	18.77	35.86
	Economically Disadvantaged	10.26	19.92	37.69
	Students With Disabilities	11.54	22	23.53
	English Language Learners	7.12	18.41	35.61

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25.47		26.13
	Economically Disadvantaged	27.3		28.61
	Students With Disabilities	11.05		12.1
	English Language Learners	18.42		20.98
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19		30.92
	Economically Disadvantaged	20.2		33.44
	Students With Disabilities	7.45		11.76
	English Language Learners	12.71		24.89
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26.39		27.57
	Economically Disadvantaged	28.05		28.98
	Students With Disabilities	13.02		13.13
	English Language Learners	19.88		22.25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20.13		30.55
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.05		31.77
	Students With Disabilities	8.42		10.74
	English Language Learners	13.96		25.11
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24.89		32.26
	Economically Disadvantaged	26.75		33.57
	Students With Disabilities	12.2		19.59
	English Language Learners	16.54		22.74
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25.86		31.74
	Economically Disadvantaged	27.71		34.62
	Students With Disabilities	8.62		12.96
	English Language Learners	17.06		23.51

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	9	24	22	26	33	26	8	26			
ELL	24	37	28	38	35	36	16	36	43		
BLK	35	43	36	47	42	47	14	50	80		
HSP	29	38	28	44	38	37	22	50	46		
WHT	48	36		69	39		50				
FRL	32	39	28	46	37	37	24	54	51		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	38	41	39	60	51	11				
ELL	18	37	41	50	61	52	19		45		
BLK	29	39	33	61	72	65	26				
HSP	32	45	44	60	63	53	30	93	66		
WHT	53	63		69	59		54				
FRL	33	46	44	61	64	56	32	94	73		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	15	35	29	35	51	39	16	46	10		
ELL	20	40	39	49	60	52	17	40	67		
BLK	24	42	37	48	52	42	26	67	80		
HSP	34	43	38	59	61	50	31	61	75		
WHT	42	61		56	71						
FRL	33	44	38	58	61	50	31	64	76		

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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	38
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	48
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	40
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?

Overall positive trends occurred for (Achievement, Learning Gains, and LG of Lowest Quartile) in all measured areas (ELA, Math, and Science) for all subgroups (SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP, WHT, FRL) from SY18 to SY19, yet percentages trended downward in the same categories for the same in SY21, falling below SY18 numbers.

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

In ELA, LGs have dropped 7% from SY19 to SY21, while LG of the Lowest Quartile have dropped 16%.

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

Covid slide due to high percentage of students attending virtually for all or some of SY21, as well as attendance issues due to quarantine.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

Ensure fidelity of ELA curriculum implementation to improve teaching and learning. Daily classroom walk-throughs (CWTs) to ensure Standard - Learning Target - Performance Task alignment along with fidelity of ELA curriculum implementation.

Improve teaching and learning within our ELA department through Collaborative Learning Team planning and data analysis to close achievement gaps (ELA 6; ELA 7; ELA 8)

Establish a Literacy Leadership Team to improve reading and language across content-areas.

Inclusive and collaborative teaching methods using Universal Design for Learning and Differentiated Instructional approaches.

Assistance for learning activities in the general education classroom through ESE support facilitation. Structured Literacy

Programming through SPIRE instruction.

The IMS MTSS Team will use the MTSS process to analyze data and provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports for students as needed for attendance and behavior.

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.

Ongoing professional learning within Collaborative Learning Teams; PD on Universal Design for Learning

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

Refine the master schedule to allow targeted support to struggling readers every day through Intervention (Grades 5), Intensive Language Arts (Grades 6-8), and Intensive Reading (Grades 6-8).

Targeted instructional coaching based on CWT data.

Ongoing progress monitoring of students in Tier 2 and Tier 3, while addressing behavior, social and emotional needs, and absenteeism.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Current Grade 5 Cohort Data:
 ELA Proficiency (3+) in SY21 = 24%
 ELA Learning Gains in SY21 = 87% (*based on retained-students only)
 ELA Bottom Quartile in SY21 = 100% (*based on retained-students only)

Current Grade 6 Cohort Data:
 ELA Proficiency (3+) in SY19 = 37% - in SY21 = 21% (-16%)
 ELA Learning Gains in SY19 = 94%- in SY21 = 20% (-74%)
 ELA Bottom Quartile in SY19 = 94% in SY21 = 9% (85%)

Current Grade 7 Cohort Data
 ELA Proficiency (3+) in SY19 = 47% - in SY21 = 39% (-8%)
 ELA Learning Gains in SY19 = 57%- in SY21 = 48% (-9%)
 ELA Bottom Quartile in SY19 = 63% in SY21 = 39% (-24%)

Current Grade 8 Cohort Data
 ELA Proficiency (3+) in SY19 = 30% - in SY21 = 37% (+7%)
 ELA Learning Gains in SY19 = 30%- in SY21 = 53% (+23%)
 ELA Bottom Quartile in SY19 = 21% in SY21 = 41% (+20%)

Measurable Outcome:

Grade 5 SY22:
 ELA Achievement 29%
 ELA Learning Gains 35%
 ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains 30%

Grade 6 SY22:
 ELA Achievement 26%
 ELA Learning Gains 25%
 ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains 35%

Grade 7 SY22:
 ELA Achievement 45%
 ELA Learning Gains 55%
 ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains 45%

Grade 8 SY22:
 ELA Achievement 42%
 ELA Learning Gains 61%
 ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains 47%

Monitoring:

Adaptive Progress Monitoring (September & January)
 Benchmark Advance Interim Assessments (Grade 5)
 Savvas Unit Assessments (Grades 6-8)
 Common Formative Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Refine the master schedule to allow targeted support to struggling readers every day through Intervention (Grades 5), Intensive Language Arts (Grades 6-8), and Intensive Reading (Grades 6-8).

Evidence-based

Ensure fidelity of ELA curriculum implementation to improve teaching and learning

Strategy:

Improve teaching and learning within our ELA department through Collaborative Learning Team planning and data analysis to close achievement gaps (ELA 6; ELA 7; ELA 8)

Establish a Literacy Leadership Team to improve reading and language across content-areas.

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

High-quality instructional materials are designed to engage students in a deeper level of learning, create a focused direction, and help teachers make connections across grade levels.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Collaborative Learning Teams empower teachers, promote collective teacher efficacy, and facilitate planning and reflection to improve teaching and learning.

Strategy:

Jennifer Bacchiochi and Mandy Rowland, our State Regional Literacy Directors, are supporting our school which has been identified to receive targeted and intensive supports through the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) Program. The first session will be geared toward school administrators and will focus on our Literacy Leadership Team.

Action Steps to Implement

Daily classroom walk-throughs (CWTs) to ensure Standard - Learning Target - Performance Task alignment along with fidelity of ELA curriculum implementation.

Person

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

Facilitate Collaborative Learning Teams that focus on learning, collaboration, and results.

Person

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

Targeted instructional coaching based on CWT data.

Person

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

Ongoing progress monitoring of students in Tier 2 and Tier 3, while addressing behavior, social and emotional needs, and absenteeism.

Person

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This subgroup has been previously designated for targeted support and intervention under ESSA. Based on last year’s ELA FSA, 32% of students without disabilities scored a Level 3 or above, while only 5% of students with disabilities scored a Level 3 or above. This represents a gap of 27 percentage points.

Measurable Outcome: Reduce the achievement gap for English Language Arts Achievement (Level 3 and Above) to 17%.

Monitoring: Adaptive Progress Monitoring (September & January)
 Benchmark Advance Interim Assessments (Grade 5)
 Savvas Unit Assessments (Grades 6-8)
 Common Formative Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Inclusive and collaborative teaching methods using Universal Design for Learning and Differentiated Instructional approaches. Assistance for learning activities in the general education classroom through ESE support facilitation. Structured Literacy Programming through SPIRE instruction. Specific evidence-based practices including but not limited to: instructional matching, reciprocal teaching, incremental rehearsal, keyword mnemonics, mystery motivator, CRA (concrete, representational, abstract), and graphic organizers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Strategies are chosen based on considered outcomes for the students. They are aligned with teacher characteristics, environment and student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development on Universal Design for Learning

Person Responsible Katy Stoner (stonerk@martinschools.org)

Classroom observations to ensure evidence-based practices for inclusive and collaborative teaching

Person Responsible Katy Stoner (stonerk@martinschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the EWS report, attendance is a critical area for improvement. We also monitor behavior through the number of referrals using the EWS report. Students who have 2 or more indicators are monitored through the MTSS system.
	We are also paying close attention to those students that were attendance issues last year and ensuring that concerns for this year are addressed immediately.
Measurable Outcome:	SY21-37 students had 2 or more referrals. We plan to decrease this number by 10% for SY22.
	SY21 had 91.09% average daily attendance. We plan to increase this number to 92% for SY22.
Monitoring:	Weekly MTSS Meetings using EWS Data to identify students. Implement PBIS Tier 1 interventions with fidelity using established practices. Implement Tier 2 interventions for students exhibiting behaviors that may lead to referrals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	The IMS MTSS Team will use the MTSS process to analyze data and provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports for students as needed for attendance and behavior.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	MTSS and PBIS are proven strategies that help schools monitor behaviors and attendance and the data provided assists schools in making data based decisions to support students and promote positive school wide behaviors and better attendance.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor attendance and utilize the following protocol:
 4-5 unexcused absences, counselor sends first letter, at 7-10 unexcused absences, counselor sends second letter and begins the intervention process. A referral to the Attendance Officer is completed along with calls home by school staff. At 15 unexcused absences, letters are sent every five absences. Follow-up with outside agencies are completed.

Person Responsible Denise Rivera (riverad@martinschools.org)

Weekly MTSS meetings with stakeholders (school and district) to track and support identified students

Person Responsible Mike Smith (smithm5@martinschools.org)

Monthly PBIS meetings to include ongoing data trend analysis and action

Person Responsible Casi Farrar (farrarc@martinschools.org)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Teaching and learning outcomes can be enhanced by way of frequent support, accompanied with actionable feedback. In recognizing that the administrative team can be challenged with the amount of time that is spent in the classrooms (offering frequent support and feedback), the goal is to identify a cadre of teacher leaders (who have demonstrated a skillset of employing highly effective instructional strategies) and build their capacity, so that they can in turn support additional teammates at IMS.

Measurable Outcome: Each teacher leader will ultimately be assigned to 1-2 teachers that are tied to a State Assessed (FSA/EOC) content area. The teachers that are receiving frequent support and feedback will have historical data (if applicable) to compare to the measurable outcomes from SY22. The goal is that the measurable performance outcomes improve from SY21. If a teacher-leader is assigned to a teacher without historical data, the site will utilize classroom observation data to measure the success of the frequent feedback and support.

Monitoring: This area will be monitored by way of classroom learning walk data throughout the year, along with discussions during Guiding Coalition meetings. In the end, the final monitoring will occur following the State Assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jeff Raimann (raimanj@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Following the research of Hattie and Timperley (2007), where they shared basic assumptions with respect to variables that moderate the effectiveness of feedback on student achievement. The type of feedback was found to be decisive, with praise, punishment, rewards, and corrective feedback all having low or low to medium effects on average, but corrective feedback being highly effective for enhancing the learning of new skills and tasks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale is simply to follow the research, in terms of utilizing a strategy that has a high probability of success.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify Campus Instructional Leaders for SY22

Person Responsible Jeff Raimann (raimanj@martinschools.org)

Provide Leadership Training via Guiding Coalition Meetings/Conducting Learning Walks. Training will include the use of Strengthsfinders, John Maxwell, and Dr. Marzano's Focused Teacher Evaluation Model (Instructional Framework).

Person Responsible Jeff Raimann (raimanj@martinschools.org)

Identify teachers to be assigned to leaders, who will receive more frequent support and actionable feedback.

Person Responsible Jeff Raimann (raimanj@martinschools.org)

Monitor the progress of teacher-leader support, as measured with the teachers identified for this initiative.

Person Responsible Jeff Raimann (raimanj@martinschools.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Grade 5
	2016-2017 - 24% proficiency
	2017-2018 - 24% proficiency
	2018-2019 - 25% proficiency
	2020-2021 - 16% proficiency
	Grade 8
	2016-2017 - 38% proficiency
	2017-2018 - 30% proficiency
	2018-2019 - 30% proficiency
	2020-2021 - 24% proficiency

Measurable Outcome: Grade 5
2021-2022 - 35% proficiency

Grade 8
2021-2022 - 35% proficiency

Monitoring: Unit Common Summative Assessments
Progress Monitoring Tests (PMT) quarterly
Classroom Walkthroughs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Borges (borgesj@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Improve teaching and learning within our Science department through Collaborative Learning Team planning and data analysis to close achievement gaps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Collaborative Learning Teams empower teachers, promote collective teacher efficacy, and facilitate planning and reflection to improve teaching and learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Support 5th Grade common planning for standards based instruction and include specific structures in common planning to facilitate conversation and deliberate planning of monitoring strategies, identifying critical information, and key questions.

Provide support in identifying Power (essential) Standards

Provide support in using Science Documents in planning for standards based instruction (IE: Quarterly Instructional Plans)

Provide support in branches of science content to increase the knowledge about a specific topic.

Person Responsible Siddhi Gullickson (gullics@martin.k12.fl.us)

Support Grades 6-8 science common planning for standards based instruction and include specific structures in common planning to facilitate conversation and deliberate planning of monitoring strategies, identifying critical information, and key questions.

Provide support in identifying Power (essential) Standards

Provide support in using Science Documents in planning for standards based instruction

Provide support in branches of science content to increase the knowledge about a specific topic.

Person Responsible Casi Farrar (farrarc@martinschools.org)

Provide support in the implementation of common science vocabulary to use in all grade levels using the Science Standards with Vocabulary document and Spanish cognates and pictures. Use of the district Science PowerPoints for vocabulary practice will be used as well. Creation of Spanish Science vocabulary resources.

Person Responsible Jennifer Borges (borgesj@martinschools.org)

Provide support in the use of Performance Matters assessments (PMTs/ CQAs) and pulling data. CSAs will be given at the culmination of each unit to review content and execution of test-taking skills via paper

Person Responsible Jennifer Borges (borgesj@martinschools.org)

Conduct classroom walkthroughs to ensure implementation of standards based instruction and interventions from data discussions.

Person Responsible Jennifer Borges (borgesj@martinschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), 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.

Primary Area of Concern: Tobacco, Alcohol, and Drug Use or Possession

17 incidents for the 2019-2020 School Year

Incident Rate per 100 Students of 2.65

Compared to Statewide Range of 0-7.07

Secondary Area of Concern: Vandalism/Theft

1 incident for the 2019-2020 School Year

Incident Rate per 100 Students of .16

Compared to Statewide Range of 0-1.91

The school will monitor discipline data to ensure cases decrease as a result of implementing Community Building Circles and Restorative Practices. The result of cases decreasing will ensure a healthier school culture and safer school environment.

Community Building Circles is a preventative practice that addresses issues such as Citizenship, Responsibility, Respect, Caring, Fairness, and Trustworthiness. Students will meet in circles once per week. The goal is to prevent unwanted behaviors from happening by having meaningful and reflective dialogue regarding various topics related to the pillars of character.

Restorative practice is support implemented to reteach behaviors and restore behaviors and/or relationships. A type of Restorative practice implemented is having Reentry meetings for those students that must serve a suspension. These re-entry conferences are a way to heal the rift that occurred with the misbehavior and the ensuing consequence, help the student transition successfully back into the classroom community, and provide an opportunity to reteach the correct behavior and the classroom expectations while avoiding blame and shame.

Another type of restorative practice is having a weekly advisory meaning students displaying repetitive unwanted behaviors related to the areas of concern. The school counselor and/or Behavior Coach will mentor weekly with students demonstrating the same unwanted behaviors or students in general who are continually cited for behavior infractions. The purpose is to minimize behaviors throughout the year.

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.

Indiantown Middle school addresses building a positive school culture and environment through the implementation of school-wide PBIS, Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports. PBIS is a multi-tiered framework that promotes positive, predictable, safe environments for students and school staff. Professional development is offered for teachers and staff to provide behavior supports needed to improve social, emotional, behavioral, and academic outcomes for all students. Teachers and staff support building a positive school culture by modeling the behaviors that we wish to see from our students.

The core PBIS team meets monthly to problem-solve around our school-wide behavior data, plan and provide students with opportunities to be rewarded for making positive choices, and support the staff. Team members and school volunteers reach out to the community for financial support of this program. Volunteers and community members generously host staff appreciation events throughout the year.

Students and teachers build a classroom community and relationships during scheduled weekly nesting time. During this time, students participate in restorative circles and other team-building activities.

We have established multiple platforms for communication with our families including, our school web page, social media site, and emailed newsletters. Our parent liaison allows for communication between school and home when language barriers are present, both verbally and through the translation of newsletters and other printed materials.

Student Advisory Council (SAC) meetings are open and families are encouraged to attend so they may gain an understanding of school culture and the policies and procedures of the School Improvement Process. A PTSA is currently being organized to promote community and family involvement at school. IMS teachers and administration host multiple parent involvement nights throughout the year.

In addition, mentors through the Boys and Girls Club are on campus daily to check in with students and provide social, emotional and academic support.

Further, Safe School Ambassadors is a program facilitated by our school counselors and behavior intervention specialist. This program trains and mentors students to model safe school practices and speak out against negativity on campus. The Character Counts program encourages character development and allows teachers to recognize a student of the week who portrays one of the 6 pillars of character; Trustworthiness, Responsibility, Respect, Fairness, Caring, and Citizenship.

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

IMS stakeholders include community members and organizations, local businesses, families, non-instructional staff, administrators, teachers, and students. All school staff are partners in our student’s success by modeling positive behaviors and acknowledging students that meet or exceed our school wide expectations with our schools currency of Thunderbucks. Volunteers, families and community business partners contribute their time and monetary contributions that support student incentives and employee appreciation events. Community partnerships such as the United Way of Martin County and the Boys and Girls Club provide additional support and resources to our school community.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$196,459.74
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0221 - Indiantown Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$64,000.00
			<i>Notes: ELA teacher</i>			
			0221 - Indiantown Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$65,500.00
			<i>Notes: Reading teacher to lower class size for students in Intensive Reading courses.</i>			
			0221 - Indiantown Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$64,000.00
			<i>Notes: Literacy Coach assigned to Grade 5 to support with new ELA curriculum</i>			
			0221 - Indiantown Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$259.74
			<i>Notes: Scholastic Scope, Language Arts monthly magazine to support new Creative Writing elective</i>			
			0221 - Indiantown Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$2,700.00
			<i>Notes: Class novel sets to support instruction within Intensive Language Arts & Critical Thinking classes (one novel per quarter, five total teachers)</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems				\$18,332.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0221 - Indiantown Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$17,332.00
			<i>Notes: Parent Liaison to provide communication and assistance for our families to support student achievement.</i>			
			0221 - Indiantown Middle School	Other		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: PBIS funds to support attendance initiatives for struggling students.</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team				\$0.00

5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$214,791.74