Martin County School District

Dr. David L. Anderson Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dr. David L. Anderson Middle School

7000 SE ATLANTIC RIDGE DR, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/ddlam

Demographics

Principal: Ebony Jarrett

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

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)	64%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (60%)
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

Dr. David L. Anderson Middle School

7000 SE ATLANTIC RIDGE DR, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/ddlam

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	55%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Be Equitable. Be Courageous. Be Proud.

Provide the school's vision statement.

ALL students high school ready without the need for remediation.

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
Aitken, Tim	Principal	
Axton, David	Assistant Principal	
McMurry, Diane	Assistant Principal	
Webster, Andrew	Teacher, K-12	Math department team leader
Belvin, Tonya	Teacher, K-12	Science department team leader
McGrath, Susan	Teacher, K-12	ELA department team leader
Sigmon, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies department team leader
Lavere, Gina	Teacher, K-12	Related Arts department team leader
Kemler, Ashley	Teacher, ESE	ESE department team leader
Register, Kristen	Instructional Coach	
Hyde, Dino	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2013, Ebony Jarrett

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.*
16

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.*

41

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

62

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,034

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

21

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

20

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	362	380	378	0	0	0	0	1120
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	43	32	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	36	25	0	0	0	0	77
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	74	64	0	0	0	0	181
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	74	61	0	0	0	0	173
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	101	78	0	0	0	0	257
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	104	114	0	0	0	0	313
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	12	5	0	0	0	0	27

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/13/2021

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	334	361	365	0	0	0	0	1060
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	29	17	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	65	54	0	0	0	0	172
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	75	54	0	0	0	0	195

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	42	50	33	0	0	0	0	125

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	5	0	0	0	0	27

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	334	361	365	0	0	0	0	1060
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	29	17	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	65	54	0	0	0	0	172
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	75	54	0	0	0	0	195

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	42	50	33	0	0	0	0	125

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	5	0	0	0	0	27

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				52%	62%	54%	50%	62%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	58%	54%	56%	60%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	51%	47%	50%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				68%	74%	58%	70%	73%	58%
Math Learning Gains				61%	68%	57%	67%	70%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	55%	51%	54%	57%	51%
Science Achievement				64%	64%	51%	62%	62%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				70%	87%	72%	82%	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	54%	57%	-3%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	42%	53%	-11%	52%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2021					
	2019	56%	62%	-6%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	61%	64%	-3%	55%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	53%	60%	-7%	54%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
08	2021					
	2019	65%	67%	-2%	46%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	61%	58%	3%	48%	13%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	74%	-74%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	43%	77%	-34%	71%	-28%

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	93%	75%	18%	61%	32%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	65%	35%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA and Math are progress monitored using the Adaptive Progress Monitoring (APM) which was administered in the Fall of 2020 and Spring of 2021. Civics (8th grade) and Science (8th grade) used district created Common Quarterly Assessments.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33.81		37.24
	Economically Disadvantaged	24.78		27.48
	Students With Disabilities	37.00		39.25
	English Language Learners	17.18		15.50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16.32		31.69
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.12		26.07
	Students With Disabilities	28.99		30.86
	English Language Learners	9.81		18.42

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33.45		37.79
	Economically Disadvantaged	23.99		28.15
	Students With Disabilities	36.73		39.81
	English Language Learners	17.44		17.98
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16.50		32.29
	Economically Disadvantaged	11.51		26.32
	Students With Disabilities	32.31		30.86
	English Language Learners	10.61		20.91
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	48.62	58.33	34.15
	Economically Disadvantaged	39.62	50.94	25.63
	Students With Disabilities	41.67	42.31	32.00
	English Language Learners	17.81	32.39	11.54

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	35.20		41.05
	Economically Disadvantaged	26.12		32.14
	Students With Disabilities	28.81		33.33
	English Language Learners	19.75		20.63
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	14.15		30.04
	Economically Disadvantaged	10.00		28.75
	Students With Disabilities	14.81		23.53
	English Language Learners	10.11		22.43
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Science	All Students	24.92		37.38
	Economically Disadvantaged	15.17		29.61
	Students With Disabilities	11.54		20.83
	English Language Learners	0		4.76

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	20	33	35	31	37	33	38	52	46		
ELL	27	37	32	32	38	42	24	55	44		
ASN	76	65		82	65				91		
BLK	44	55	44	45	37	33	44	71	70		
HSP	35	41	36	42	40	39	44	66	59		
MUL	46	53	58	35	33	40	64	67	67		
WHT	58	55	48	64	47	52	72	87	71		
FRL	37	43	40	41	38	41	51	67	58		
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	23	47	46	44	64	65	29				
ELL	19	46	52	39	51	49	26		59		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	89	90		100	65				100		
BLK	36	40	33	53	48	56	38				
HSP	39	49	51	58	59	57	53		70		
MUL	44	49		61	49	30	50		70		
WHT	63	57	49	77	65	55	74		79		
FRL	40	48	46	60	58	55	53		70		
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	25	45	45	34	55	51	27	52			
ELL	21	49	46	51	59	51	24	65	57		
ASN	78	74		100	87				100		
BLK	36	64	55	53	67	74	48	70	42		
HSP	37	50	46	60	61	49	45	77	59		
MUL	56	50	27	74	72		69	73	36		
WHT	59	59	56	78	71	57	75	87	67		
FRL	40	52	49	62	64	53	52	76	51		

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	52
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	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	519
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	37
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	76
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
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	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	51
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	62
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

AMS continues to see a drop in proficiency for 7th grade ELA when compared to 6th and 8th grade, although the gap has decreased from 2019 to 2021 (2019=12 pt drop; 2021 = 2 pt drop). In ELA, ESE and ELL students report large gaps, with all sub-groups demonstrating a decline.

Math scores have seen a significant decline in proficiency (68% in 2019 to 52% in 2021). Similar to ELA, ESE and ELL students demonstrate a large gap in proficiency.

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

ELA and Math proficiency scores continue to be the areas that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement across all grade levels.

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

From 2019 to 2021, AMS experienced a significant loss of experienced teachers due to COVID-19. In addition, data for 2021, including progress monitoring data, was hindered by inconsistency in student attendance throughout the school year. Many students spent all or a significant portion of the year learning from home and teachers were adjusting to a new medium of teaching by using synchronous classrooms via Zoom.

In 2021-2022, our ELA and Math teachers are fully staffed; however, we will have 2 teachers on leave in each subject.

ELA teachers are using the newly adopted Savvas curriculum for ELA and following the district pacing calendar. Unit assessments will be given quarterly, with data analysis completed after each assessment for progress monitoring. Adaptive Progress Monitoring (APM) assessments will also be given in September, 2021 (baseline) and January, 2022 (growth).

Math teachers will use CQA assessments for progress monitoring quarterly. APM assessments will be given in September, 2021 (baseline) and January, 2022 (growth) for grades 6-8 math This year, we are also offering tiered levels of instruction in math with additional math supports offered through a elective class.

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

Civics EOC scores are continuing to improve, increasing from 70% proficiency in 2019 to 77% proficiency in 2021.
Pass rates for Algebra I and Geometry also remain strong.

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

The Civics team worked collaboratively to share lesson plans and ideas as well as CQA data was monitored. Two of the three Civics teachers were new to the subject in 2021 and worked collaboratively with the Social Studies team leader to deliver instruction.

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

Students are encouraged to take Algebra in eighth grade to accelerate their learning. To prepare students for this path, all students in 6th grade take an accelerated math course. In 7th grade, most students continue with the accelerated math course, which provides exposure to Pre-Algebra content. Students who indicate need for more support are offered a math class combined with a supporting elective class to allow them additional time to master the math standards. This practice carries over into 8th grade, for students who need additional support with Algebra.

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.

AMS continues to focus on AVID instructional strategies including WICOR (Writing to Learn, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading to Learn). Additionally, math teachers are incorporating P.E.E.R. which focuses on the Marzano elements of "Practicing" "Examining similarities and differences" "Examining errors in reasoning" and "Revising knowledge" as a structure to help students gain deeper understanding, particularly in math.

Many teachers have made P.E.E.R. a focus for their deliberate practice to deepen their instructional confidence in this strategy. This will be used as an instructional strategy, especially in ELA and math.

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

This year, we have an instructional coach dedicated to our school. The instructional coach assists in modeling instructional strategies, developing engaging lessons and analyzing content. The instructional coach is instrumental in developing new teachers as well as providing ongoing support for teachers of all experience levels.
Specifically, the instructional coach uses classroom walk-through data that is collected by the school's guiding coalition members and Literacy Leadership team to identify learning strategies that would benefit teachers. These strategies are presented in monthly sessions, "WICOR Wednesdays" for all teachers during the school day.
These practices align with the District Success Plan: Employee Success - Goal #4: Ensuring all employees receive meaningful and relevant professional development.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The district provided new instructional materials to support the ELA classroom. In addition, a pacing calendar was provided by the district to align instruction district-wide. ELA teachers have adopted this calendar which will ensure that the new B.E.S.T. standards are presented to all students. After school tutoring will be offered to students for support in ELA. The tutoring will begin on October 17, 2021-December 17, 2021. The positions will be highly qualified ELA teachers with additional support from bilingual staff.. This area of focus aligns with the Martin County School District's Success Plan: Student Success - Goal #1 - Academic Achievement in ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA students will demonstrate an increase in proficiency of 5% as measure by the APM and ultimately the 2022 FSA. Although 2019 data shows AMS school proficiency at 52%, 2021 data indicates a proficiency of 46%. The goal for ELA proficiency for 2022 is 51%, an increase of 5%.
Monitoring:	Adaptive Progress Monitoring tests were given in September, 2021 to establish a baseline. Spring 2022 APM assessments will be used to evaluate progress. Additionally, all ELA classes will deliver Unit Assessments (UA) at the end of each quarter which will reflect progress relative to the standards taught each quarter.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Diane McMurry (mcmurrd@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use the PEER instructional strategy in the ELA classroom. Students who scored Level 1 on the ELA FSA in the prior year will use the Lexia Power Up reading program to help remediate reading skills in an Intensive Reading class in addition to the ELA class. Students who scored Level 2 on the ELA FSA in the prior year will have a reading-centered elective class in addition to the ELA class.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PEER comes from the Marzano evaluation tool. It incorporates the elements of Helping students PRACTICE skills, strategies & processes, Helping students EXAMINE similarities and differences, Helping students EXAMINE their reasoning and Helping students REVISE knowledge. The Unit Assessments are part of the SAVVAS curriculum, and the APM is provided by the state.

Action Steps to Implement

The Literacy Leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs of ELA and Intensive Reading classes to ensure implementation matches the Savvas pacing guide. Results of the weekly walkthroughs will be shared with the Literacy Leadership team monthly.

Person Responsible	Diane McMurry (mcmurrd@martinschools.org)

Instructional Coach will meet with the ELA department during their weekly planning sessions and provide support to teachers.

Person Responsible	Kristen Register (registk@martin.k12.fl.us)

Grade level teacher teams will review student data from the Unit Assessments, given in October and December, and from APM, given in January, 2022. Data will be used to guide remediation and enrichment.

Person Responsible   Tim Aitken (aitkent@martinschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	From 2019 to 2021, math proficiency scores have seen a significant decline from 68% to 52%. Additionally, many students were affected by a loss of instructional time in the 4th quarter of 2020 and throughout the school year of 2020-2021 due to COVID-19. As a result, students may be lacking foundational math skills. After school tutoring will be offered to students for support in math and algebra. The tutoring will begin on October 17, 2021-December 17, 2021. The positions will be highly qualified math teachers with additional support from bilingual staff.. This area of focus aligns with the Martin County School District's Success Plan: Student Success - Goal #3 - Academic Achievement in Mathematics.
Measurable Outcome:	Math students will demonstrate an increase in proficiency of 5% as measure by the APM and ultimately the 2022 FSA. Although 2019 data shows AMS school proficiency at 68%, 2021 data indicates a proficiency of 52%. The goal for math proficiency for 2022 is 57%, an increase of 5%.
Monitoring:	Adaptive Progress Monitoring tests were given in September, 2021 to establish a baseline. Spring 2022 APM assessments will be used to evaluate progress. Additionally, grade 6-8 math classes will deliver Common Quarterly Assessments at the end of each quarter which will reflect progress relative to the standards taught each quarter.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Diane McMurry (mcmurrd@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will incorporate the PEER strategy as an instructional strategy. Grade level teams will use data from CQA (Oct & Dec) to guide instruction. APM will be used as progress monitoring in January, 2022 Students who were identified by their previous years' math teacher as needing extra assistance are scheduled into math classes as a block (2 class periods with the same math teacher). For students who scored a Level 1 on the prior year FSA, a Critical Thinking elective class is provided to focus on remediating math skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PEER comes from the Marzano evaluation tool. It incorporates the elements of Helping students PRACTICE skills, strategies & processes, Helping students EXAMINE similarities and differences, Helping students EXAMINE their reasoning and Helping students REVISE knowledge. The school district provides the CQA assessments, and the APM is provided by the state.
Action Steps to Implement	

Math department will meet monthly to review student learning progress.

Person Responsible	Andrew Webster (webstea@martin.k12.fl.us)

Math department will review student data from the CQAs given in October and December, 2021 as well as the APM given in January, 2022.

Person Responsible	Diane McMurry (mcmurrd@martinschools.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The population of students whose first language is not English is growing at a rapid pace. In 2019, 132 students participated in WIDA testing. In 2021, 163 eligible ELL students are currently enrolled. Based on 2019 data, the ELL subgroup reported 19% proficiency in ELA, with learning gains at 46% and bottom quartile learning gains at 52%. Based on 2019 data, the ELL subgroup reported 39% proficiency in Math, with learning gains at 49% and bottom quartile learning gains at 49%. While proficiency scores are substantially lower for ELL students compared to non-ELL students (ELA = 32% gap; Math = 26% gap), ELL students do show strong growth numbers, as reported above. Our focus is to support ELL students to increase proficiency and growth performance by 5% in each subject area. After school tutoring will be offered to students for support in ELA, math and science. The tutoring will begin on October 17, 2021-December 17, 2021. The positions will be highly qualified teachers with additional support from bilingual staff. This area of focus aligns with the Martin County School District's Success Plan: Student Success - Goal #1 - Academic Achievement in ELA and Goal #3 - Academic Achievement in Mathematics.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELL proficiency in ELA by 5% to 25% as measured by APM, UA and ultimately 2022 FSA. Increase ELL proficiency in Math by 5 % to 44% as measured by APM, CQA and ultimately 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	Use UA, CQA data quarterly to monitor ELL progress toward proficiency and identify areas in need to remediation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	David Axton (axtond@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ELL support facilitators will provide assistance to students and classroom teachers to help facilitate learning for ELL students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Ryan (2010) reports that "finding strategies that allow teachers to incorporate students' native languages into the classroom, even when the teacher does not speak the language, is a vital issue for educators today". Using WICOR strategies that are modified specifically for ELL students uses best teaching practices with native language support. Reference: Ryan, E. (2010). Using student's native languages in the classroom: Rationale and strategies for monolingual teachers. Vanderbilt University. https://ir.vanderbilt.edu/handle/1803/3997

Action Steps to Implement

Include ELL paras in the WICOR Wednesday PD each month to increase knowledge of instructional strategies.

Person Responsible	Kristen Register (registk@martin.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

The school incident ranking for AMS is "Very Low" based on 2019-2020 data.

The PBIS team reviews behavior and suspension data regularly, as does the MTSS team.

This year, AMS has a new School Resource Officer who maintains an active presence on the campus.

In addition to reporting major behavior offenses through the referral system, teachers use a "short form" referral that is designed to deliver immediate consequences to students for minor offenses such as dress code and technology infractions.

Teachers and staff are expected to maintain a presence in the hallways and courtyard during high traffic times to deter inappropriate student behaviors.

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.

Building a positive culture is a multi-layered approach.
+ Building common beliefs, language, and expectations
+ Engaging in Collaborative Learning Teams
+ Creating cross-curricular teacher teams who share the same 110 students
+ Curriculum mapping and assessment writing
+ Weekly communication
+ Honoring teachers time with differentiated professional development (T4TPD)
+ Encourage risk-taking, reflection, and meta-cognition
+ Using Instructional coach to provide side-by-side support, modeling, and strategy sharing
Teachers grow when they are trusted to make decisions, have some autonomy, and are given time to reflect on practices and decisions.

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

Stakeholders:
+ Teachers, Staff, Students, Parents, and community members
Roles:
Engagement, participation, and input. Creating vision and mission statements to lead the school's culture and performance action steps keeps every stakeholder involved as decisions makers. When people are engaged, participate, and provide input in the direction of the school, they become empowered contributors. Engaged stakeholders will leave and help share inclusive and interactive messages in the community. This model also helps develop synergy among teachers and parents. A unified team of parents and teachers is the strongest foundation of learning for students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$1,600.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	4100-MARKET ORDER ASSESSMENTS	0361 - Dr. David L. Anderson Middle School	Other Federal		$1,600.00
			Notes: ELA support will be provided 4 days/wk 2 teachers 4 hrs each 8 x $25 x 8wks			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$1,600.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	4100-MARKET ORDER ASSESSMENTS	0361 - Dr. David L. Anderson Middle School	Other Federal		$1,600.00
			Notes: Math tutors after school 4 hrs/week 2 teachers 2 x 4hrs x $25 x 8 weeks			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners				$4,600.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	4100-MARKET ORDER ASSESSMENTS	0361 - Dr. David L. Anderson Middle School	Title, I Part A		$4,600.00
			Notes: Bilingual support for After School programs thru Title One 2 staff members/4 hours per wk/23 wks 2 x 4 x $25 x 23			
					Total:	$7,800.00