

Bay District Schools

Merritt Brown 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	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Merritt Brown Middle School

5044 MERRITT BROWN WAY, Panama City, FL 32404

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Gelonda Martin

Start Date for this Principal: 12/16/2019

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)	88%
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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 was approved by the Bay County School Board on 9/28/2021.

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	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Merritt Brown Middle School

5044 MERRITT BROWN WAY, Panama City, FL 32404

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	22%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 9/28/2021.

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.

Merritt Brown Middle School (MBMS) creates a safe and nurturing environment that inspires student achievement. Our faculty and staff are dedicated to developing well-rounded scholars, life-long learners, and successful leaders of the future through practice and rigorous standards-based curricula.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Merritt Brown Middle School will be a compassionate community in which the character of each individual is exemplified through service.

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
Treadway, Nina	Teacher, K-12	Serves as a liaison and department head for the ELA department.
Simmons, Anna	Teacher, K-12	Serves as a liaison and department head for the Math department.
Granberg, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Serves as a liaison and department head for the Social Studies department.
McNeil, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	Serves as a liaison and department head for the Autism department.
Pender, Sheri	Other	Provides ELA services to Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.
Watson-Raines, Hope	Other	Provides math services to Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.
Fowler, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	Serves as a liaison for the 6th grade team.
Bufkin, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Serves as a liaison for the 7th grade team.
Berry, Dana	Teacher, K-12	Serves as a liaison for the 8th grade team.
Westlake, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	Serves as the liaison for the PBIS committee and disciplinary intervention.
Privett, Melissa	Other	Analyzes disciplinary trends and works with the PBIS Chair on intervention and character education. Serves as the administrative point-of-contact for social studies, science, and electives.
Hall, Judy	Assistant Principal	Serves as the administrative point-of-contact for ELA and Autism.
Martin, Gelonda	Principal	Serves as the administrative point-of-contact for school improvement, the multi-tiered system of supports team, and mathematics. Works with District personnel on professional development initiatives.
Bennett, Tameka	Teacher, K-12	Serves as a liaison and department head for Science.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 12/16/2019, Gelonda Martin

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

3

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

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

677

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

12

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

12

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	0	241	219	211	0	0	0	0	671
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	72	62	0	0	0	0	196
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	23	31	0	0	0	0	74
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	23	25	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	10	19	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	62	87	0	0	0	0	206
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	75	77	0	0	0	0	239
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	0	52	57	66	0	0	0	0	175

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	12	20	17	0	0	0	0	49
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	13	0	0	0	0	31

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/8/2021

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	0	209	204	198	0	0	0	0	611
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	23	36	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	61	64	0	0	0	0	159
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	11	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	3	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	32	35	0	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	42	44	0	0	0	0	154

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	47	48	0	0	0	0	152

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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	10	0	0	0	0	23

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	0	209	204	198	0	0	0	0	611
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	23	36	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	61	64	0	0	0	0	159
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	11	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	3	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	32	35	0	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	42	44	0	0	0	0	154

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	47	48	0	0	0	0	152

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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	10	0	0	0	0	23

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				45%	56%	54%	46%	54%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	59%	54%	51%	54%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	55%	47%	41%	47%	47%
Math Achievement				45%	60%	58%	50%	61%	58%
Math Learning Gains				42%	55%	57%	47%	61%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	55%	51%	55%	58%	51%
Science Achievement				39%	50%	51%	41%	51%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				68%	72%	72%	68%	76%	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	46%	56%	-10%	54%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	52%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
08	2021					
	2019	46%	59%	-13%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	38%	53%	-15%	55%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	36%	59%	-23%	54%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
08	2021					
	2019	46%	48%	-2%	46%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	39%	51%	-12%	48%	-9%
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	72%	74%	-2%	71%	1%

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	89%	64%	25%	61%	28%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	62%	38%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Fall and Winter results from the MAP assessment were used to compile the data below.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			83/214 39%
	Economically Disadvantaged			39/122 32%
	Students With Disabilities			11/68 17%
	English Language Learners			1/7 14%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			70/214 33%
	Economically Disadvantaged			34/122 28%
	Students With Disabilities			10/65 15%
	English Language Learners			1/8 13%

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	82/145 %	73/176 41%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	85/49 69%	54/118 46%	
	Students With Disabilities	5/14 36%	9/48 19%	
	English Language Learners	2/5 40%	4/10 40%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	54/181 30%	43/211 20%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	34/117 29%	23/135 17%	
	Students With Disabilities	5/45 11%	4/52 8%	
	English Language Learners	1/7 14%	3/7 4%	
	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	75/141 53%	85/196 43%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	41/82 50%	40/114 35%	
	Students With Disabilities	15/37 41%	13/48 27%	
	English Language Learners	1/6 17%	2/6 33%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	59/164 36%	60/198 30%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	29/97 30%	23/117 20%	
	Students With Disabilities	9/43 21%	12/50 24%	
	English Language Learners	0/6 0%	0/6 0%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	24	32	25	19	28	26	24	41			
ELL	25			18							
BLK	33	43		21	24						
HSP	34	36	50	35	22		42	53	27		
MUL	46	50		44	26		40	80			
WHT	36	33	29	38	36	31	40	58	54		
FRL	33	35	35	30	34	28	34	52	41		
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	22	38	39	29	45	48	24	38			
ASN	67	75		73	45						
BLK	25	42		42	42			62			

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
HSP	52	58		56	42						
MUL	53	56		50	60						
WHT	45	50	45	44	41	54	41	68	41		
FRL	41	48	41	42	40	51	34	67	41		
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	22	38	33	28	43	43	26	46			
ASN	53	41		71	59						
BLK	50	55	64	36	38	46	24				
HSP	42	63		63	46			55			
MUL	63	55		59	37		36		50		
WHT	46	50	39	49	47	55	43	68	45		
FRL	41	50	42	47	46	56	37	64	35		

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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	350
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	22
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	30
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	37
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	48
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	39
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
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?

Each year from 2015 to 2021, except 2018, ELA achievement percent proficiencies have decreased - 54, 49, 44, 46, 45, 37 (2 year time-frame from 2019-2021). Mathematics achievement percent proficiencies have decreased from 2015 - 2021 -- 52, 52, 50, 50, 45, 37 (2 year time-frame from 2019-2021). Except for school year 2017-2018, there were decreases each year in science achievement between school years 2014-2015 and 2020-2021. In social studies, there was a decrease in achievement from school years 2018-2019 to 2020-2021. Between school years 2018-2019 and 2020-2021, there was a decrease in learning gains, to include school-wide learning gains and gains in the lower 25%, in ELA and mathematics.

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

Based on data from 2018-2019 and 2020-2021, the greatest decreases occurred in the percentage of students who achieved ELA learning gains. Fifty-one percent (51%) of students made a learning gain during school year 2018-2019 and thirty-four (34%) made a learning gain during school year 2020-2021. In the lowest 25%, in school year 2018-2019, forty-three percent (43%) made a learning gain; thirty-three percent (33%) made a learning gain in school year 2020-2021.

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

In addition to the yearly decreases (from 2014 - 2019) that are noted in 1a, approximately 1/3 of the student population attended school via Baylink for a part or all of the first semester. Intensive intervention is needed for many as the baseline data gathered from iReady at the beginning of this school year is indicative that approximately 51% of the student population is 3 or more grade levels behind in ELA.

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

Based on 2019 state assessments and in comparison to the 2021 state assessment, the acceleration component increased by 3%, from 43% to 46%.

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

Teaching strategies, to include strategies for engaging students, used by the teacher assigned to math acceleration attributed to the increase. Additionally, the number of students who passed a CTE exam (the year prior) increased from the previous year (2 years ago).

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

Teachers will differentiate instruction to meet the learning needs of each student. The number of students who are provided access to an algebra course will increase. A focus will be increasing family engagement in the pre- advanced placement (pre-AP) program at Merritt. Bear Intervention/ Enrichment sessions will be properly implemented in a manner that is conducive to student learning.

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.

Teachers will be provided professional development on differentiating instruction. A pre-AP committee will be formed to explore the meaning of (pre) advanced placement at the middle school level and the mission of our program at Merritt. Professional development opportunities for pre-AP have been and will be provided via the District Office. Collaborative opportunities will be afforded during Professional Learning Communities to support teachers in the area of data exploration as it pertains to intervention/enrichment.

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

Reading and math intervention classes with the lowest 25% will receive push-in support via interventionists. Bear Intervention will be used to provide additional help to struggling students. Teachers will continue to receive professional development and support to implement effective small group instruction. Standards-based data analysis will convene for common assessment results.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on iReady data from August of 2021, 50% of our student population scored 3 or more grade levels below on the informational text grade level placement.

Measurable Outcome: Twenty (20) percent of ELA students will increase one grade level in the area of informational text as measured by iReady data by February 15, 2022.

Monitoring: The ELA Professional Learning Community will monitor iReady, formative assessment, and common assessment data in coordination with Dr. Sheri Pender, the ELA Interventionist.

The ELA Interventionist will use i-Ready diagnostic data to identify students for which intensive intervention will be provided via push-in and pull-out support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Judy Hall (hallja@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Gradual Release Model

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Through the Gradual Release Model, teachers can meet the needs of students during each stage of instruction and fade their support as needed to help the students reach independence.

Action Steps to Implement

The ELA team will create and support class incentives to promote student engagement and appropriate behavior, in both the classroom- and school levels.

Person Responsible: Nina Treadway (treadnp@bay.k12.fl.us)

Data will be used to determine which students will be sent to intervention to receive additional instruction and support.

Person Responsible: Nina Treadway (treadnp@bay.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will implement differentiated instructional strategies, small group instruction, and The Gradual Release Model to increase students' understanding of grade-level skills and standards.

Person Responsible: Gelonda Martin (townsgk@bay.k12.fl.us)

During PLC meetings, teachers of common grade levels will discuss curriculum challenges, iReady data, and common assessment data.

Person Responsible: Nina Treadway (treadnp@bay.k12.fl.us)

The ELA Interventionist will push into intensive classes to provide Tier 2 support and may use the pull-out model when needed to provide additional intervention.

Person Responsible: Sheri Pender (pendesp@bay.k12.fl.us)

The Parent Liaison Follow-up with families to address needs and attendance issues.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Use Canvas to show daily formative assignments so that families of absent students are aware of assignments.

Person Responsible Judy Hall (hallja@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The 2020-2021 behavior data revealed that our students have the most write-ups in the areas of inappropriate behavior/language and defiance. A recent pull and analysis of current behavioral data indicates that this is still our greatest problem areas. Students who are not in class due to suspensions are missing key classroom instruction.

Measurable Outcome: During the 2021-2022 school year, we will reduce the number of discipline referrals in the areas of inappropriate behavior/ language and defiance, in the classroom setting, by 20% as measured by the monthly MTSS behavioral report.

Teachers will enter all data for students of concern to the 2021-2022 Grade Level PLC Spreadsheet prior to the scheduled monthly meeting. PLC members will collaborate with each other to discuss strategies and solutions to the issues identified.

Monitoring: The behavioral school improvement team will monitor behavioral trends and lead the Positive Behavioral Intervention (PBIS) Committee using the results from their data analysis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melissa Privett (privemm@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The Bear Development Lab will utilize a curriculum that is geared towards educating students on coping skills, appropriate behaviors for school, as well as conflict resolution to circumvent a major infraction from occurring. Frequent two-way parent communication will ensure that all stakeholders are actively involved. Positive reinforcement for good behavior will be in the form of PBIS tokens/rewards. Teachers will properly supervise students in classrooms and assigned areas to ensure that students meet Merritt Brown expectations for behavior. Teachers who are in need of additional support will receive such through coaching and training.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Bear Development Lab & Character Education ~ Trending discipline data reveals that in-school suspension is not an effective disciplinary consequence for those students who are repeating the same infractions. In an effort to be more effective, students will be taught traits that are desirable in model citizens, rewarded when they exhibit these positive behaviors, and taught alternative positive behaviors and coping mechanisms when they do not exhibit appropriate behaviors.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus	
Description and Rationale:	Collaborative teams will focus on collecting and analyzing data to determine if instructional decisions are improving student learning. Teams will use the results of collaboration to drive instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	At least two (2) out of four (4) professional learning community meetings will be used to analyze results of common assessments, D & F reports, and iReady data.
Monitoring:	The Leadership Team will be responsible for monitoring the fidelity of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) participation and will assist in monitoring outcomes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLCs have been at the forefront of transforming schools to improve student achievement. Effective PLCs are founded on the shared vision and values of improving learning outcomes for all students. When staff have ongoing, consistent meeting times for PLCs such that they are able to respond to students' needs in a timely manner, those responses are shown to have a greater impact in ensuring all students have equitable opportunities to learn and grow academically.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Analyzing student data will help teachers determine whether students are learning, and make instructional changes as needed.

Action Steps to Implement

Allot time for common planning time to include grade level and departmental PLCs.

Person Responsible Gelonda Martin (townsgk@bay.k12.fl.us)

Teams will plan/discuss common assessments.
 Teachers will administer common assessments.
 Teachers will prepare their student data.
 During PLCs, grade level teams will collate and analyze student data.
 Teams will determine which strategies will be implemented to improve student learning.
 Teachers will implement, in their classroom and BEAR intervention, the strategies discussed in the team meeting.
 Administration will monitor fidelity of meetings and implementation of strategies.
 At the 4½ week point of the 9 weeks, PLCs will discuss and analyze D/F reports, then implement steps 6 and 7.

Person Responsible Gelonda Martin (townsgk@bay.k12.fl.us)

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.

Based on 2019-2020 data that is displayed, in comparison to other schools, the number of violent incidents and property incidents is ranked low while the number of drug/public order incidents ranked high. Per 100 students, there were 3.8 incidents reported. The total reported suspensions (48 per 100) ranked high. Behavior and disciplinary data will be reviewed to determine how values and beliefs may be attributing to disciplinary write-ups and how behavioral incidents are handled. The location of disciplinary incidents and the conditions under which incidents occur will be noted so that improvements and/or professional development can be planned to shape attitudes, behaviors, and values that impact school operations.

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.

Merritt Brown fosters a positive school culture by celebrating personal achievement and good behavior.

Additionally, a positive school culture is fostered through relationship building, team collaborations, and a establishing a sense of pride and belonging.

Staff and students will be celebrated for their achievements via monthly recognitions. Good behavior will be rewarded through Merritt's token economy system in which students can earn tokens for exhibiting good behaviors noted in the character education trait of the month and spend tokens earned on things that they value.

School norms have been established and clearly communicated to students. Signage is posted at the entrance and exits to building hallways. Additional signage will be added.

Administration will use the Bay Discipline Matrix consistently except in extraordinary situations that may call for a different measure.

The Leadership Team will model the behaviors that we want to see in our school.

Students will be engaged in ways that are beneficial to them. Instruction will be differentiated for students to meet their needs.

Professional development will be provided for teachers to help them to improve their craft.

Ensure that stakeholders have a voice by incorporating feedback from leadership team meetings, MTSS meetings, and surveys into action steps.

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

Dr. Martin will facilitate the choosing of the staff member of the month and student of the month by guiding the vote via departments, teams, and administration. She will work with Sandra Grouev, the media specialist, to celebrate the chosen individuals on Merritt's television network.

Coaches, club sponsors, and faculty will be responsible for a positive school culture is fostered through relationship building, team collaborations, and a establishing a sense of pride and belonging. Coaches will foster a rapport with players and will hold them accountable in all facets of school leadership. Club sponsors will uphold the standards and expectations that the club sets and asks of the student and in addition will offer opportunities for the students to contribute to the school and to the community. Faculty will model school set expectations for the students as well as for their peers.

Shannon Westlake will head the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and work with Melissa Privett to provide guidance to faculty and staff about the character education trait of the month.

Jennifer Belles, the Merritt Brown bookkeeper ordered signage that was recommended by the Leadership team for posting in the school. Melissa Privett, the facilities point-of-contact, will ensure that all signage is hung appropriately.

Dr. Martin will facilitate meetings to review disciplinary practices with administration. The administrative team will consistently assign disciplinary consequences.

District colleagues will facilitate training on differentiation to promote student engagement and meeting the needs of all students.

Administration will ensure that input from leadership meetings and surveys is incorporated in action steps and decisions that are made.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00