South Fork High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

South Fork High School

10000 SW BULLDOG WAY, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/sfhs

Demographics

Principal: Tim Aitken

Start Date for this Principal: 7/6/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
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 (59%) 2017-18: B (58%) 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

South Fork High School

10000 SW BULLDOG WAY, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/sfhs

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)
High School 9-12	No	43%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Every student at South Fork High School will graduate with their cohort, equipped with the skills to be college or career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

South Fork High School provides a safe environment for a diverse community of students to become lifelong learners through a rigorous academic curriculum.

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
Blavatt, Jay	Principal	
Connolly, Andrew	Assistant Principal	
Cizek, Janice	Assistant Principal	
Geiger, Edmund	Assistant Principal	
Scott, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	
Klinedinst, Darcy	Teacher, K-12	
Destefanis, Richard	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/6/2017, Tim Aitken

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
103

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,864

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
16

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
18

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	0	0	0	577	500	480	446	2003
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	86	96	104	387
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	17	10	9	80
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	40	33	15	144
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	50	43	18	173
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	115	91	35	375
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	134	91	14	323
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	0	3	15

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/14/2021

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	0	0	0	546	471	471	412	1900
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	42	44	63	218
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	3	5	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	25	23	35	91
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	21	36	27	110
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	95	88	77	380
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	50	37	40	192
	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	83	68	64	64	279

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	1	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	2	3	18

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	0	0	0	546	471	471	412	1900
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	42	44	63	218
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	3	5	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	25	23	35	91
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	21	36	27	110
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	95	88	77	380
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	50	37	40	192
	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	83	68	64	64	279

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	1	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	2	3	18

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				58%	71%	56%	57%	69%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	59%	51%	50%	59%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	55%	42%	34%	52%	44%
Math Achievement				55%	69%	51%	54%	63%	51%
Math Learning Gains				42%	52%	48%	51%	56%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	46%	45%	40%	44%	45%
Science Achievement				71%	82%	68%	70%	82%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				76%	84%	73%	71%	76%	71%

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
09	2021					
	2019	60%	61%	-1%	55%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	52%	59%	-7%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

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

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	70%	74%	-4%	67%	3%

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

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	76%	78%	-2%	70%	6%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	51%	75%	-24%	61%	-10%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	57%	65%	-8%	57%	0%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Reading numbers are based off 2020-2021 APM1 and APM2 data in FOCUS (No Winter so will default to zero)
Math numbers are based off a combination of the 2020-2021 Algebra I and Geometry CQA1, CQA2, and CQA3
Biology numbers are based off the 2020-2021 Biology CQA1, CQA2, and CQA3
U.S. History numbers are based off the 2020-2021 U.S. History CQA1, CQA2, and CQA3

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38.51	0	51.46
	Economically Disadvantaged	26.03	0	37.87
	Students With Disabilities	11.72	0	19.38
	English Language Learners	9.7	0	17.03
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14.77	8.81	6.67
	Economically Disadvantaged	9.48	6.45	4.41
	Students With Disabilities	9.47	7.09	1.22
	English Language Learners	6.03	4.7	1.18
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47.87	60.13	51.73
	Economically Disadvantaged	47.03	54.81	42.72
	Students With Disabilities	38.46	41.07	39.13
	English Language Learners	36.17	47.31	40.45
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36.93	0	49.95
	Economically Disadvantaged	24.02	0	36.46
	Students With Disabilities	9.7	0	16.13
	English Language Learners	8.29	0	16.67
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14.1	8.03	6.81
	Economically Disadvantaged	10.17	6.28	5.2
	Students With Disabilities	6.52	5.51	2.38
	English Language Learners	5.21	3.96	.6
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40.81	0	47.31
	Economically Disadvantaged	29.53	0	36.57
	Students With Disabilities	8	0	13.33
	English Language Learners	3.64	0	20.34
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10.04	5.47	5.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.17	6.25	6.13
	Students With Disabilities	3.77	4.65	2.82
	English Language Learners	5.43	4.41	1.71
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29.8	63.81	44.56
	Economically Disadvantaged	28.81	61.54	42.52
	Students With Disabilities	23.53	56.1	20
	English Language Learners	11.27	56.04	28.77

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6.85	2.67	8.40
	Economically Disadvantaged	4.92	3.08	8.62
	Students With Disabilities	3.03	0	3.23
	English Language Learners	1.85	3.64	2.08
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	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	13	26	25	18	19	30	34	24		96	35
ELL	14	30	32	15	15	15	37	28		87	19
ASN	94	56					100				
BLK	28	41	41	24	16	21	53	40		96	22
HSP	32	37	36	23	18	22	50	45		92	41

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
MUL	55	33		23	30		80			100	58
WHT	62	51	40	48	22	23	71	69		99	73
FRL	34	38	39	26	18	19	53	52		95	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	19	37	32	29	33	31	37	46		95	30
ELL	18	26	23	36	29	35	37	42		66	33
ASN	94	73					90			100	90
BLK	45	54	52	29	39	55	59	69		97	25
HSP	40	39	28	43	35	30	57	63		76	47
MUL	61	57		38				83			
WHT	69	61	47	66	47	48	81	85		97	74
FRL	43	45	34	44	34	36	59	65		85	47

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	18	29	29	31	32	29	23	48		69	32
ELL	15	31	32	33	40	42	35	21		62	42
ASN	88	50		82	91			88			
BLK	36	43	42	38	42	43	43	58		83	28
HSP	41	42	33	43	42	40	55	51		74	54
MUL	64	59		64	68		83				
WHT	68	56	34	61	56	36	80	80		91	76
FRL	43	43	32	45	47	43	59	58		77	49

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	538
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	31
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	83
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	38
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	41
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	54
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	56
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	43
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?

Overall decline (2021 vs. 2019)- Greatest gaps in academic achievement are ELL to non-ELL, ESE to non ESE. Algebra performance is 30 point decline over prior year averages, whereas geometry was less. Subgroup gaps in performance sees many over a 20 point threshold most notable with groups mentioned.

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

Learning gains in mathematics, African American mathematics achievement dropped 9 points

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

Changes in staff, lack of unified application to standards, student prior knowledge, buy in and work ethic. Changes include modifying to Alg. 1A/1B course in 1 year. Increased oversight in CLTs. Increased number of students that will be tested diffuses the impact that fewer students have on weighting of statistics.

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

ELA Achievement and Biology achievement in 2018-19 both saw an increase. ELA saw an increase in student achievement on PM tests (APM) in 2020-21 increasing 13 points (9 &10th).

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

Increased short term standard aligned assessments and increased oversight in CLT process. An assessment that repeats standards shows progress towards mastery.

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

Enhanced use of CLT process to unify assessments, drill down data points and insure instruction and assessments are aligned to the level of the standard. Assessments mimic the look and rigor of high stake assessments. Increased PD on Ellevation software. Greater collaboration between tiered intervention support personnel between content areas.

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.

Increased PD on Ellevation software, New teacher onboarding, technology tools, AVID WICOR, targeted intervention and assignments using technology to individualize learning, CLT process, literacy team, math learning team

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

Administrative oversight, evaluation process, pop ins, data dialogues, trend data analysis, assessment audits

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Enhance student achievement in math. 843 test takers in Algebra & Geometry.
Measurable Outcome:	Math achievement rate to 55% (an increase from 35 in 2021 and aligned to 2018 score).
Monitoring:	Regular intervals of standards based assessments (site and district created), ongoing data evaluation in CLT
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jay Blavatt (blavatj@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	CLT, CQA tests, Academic Boot Camp, common planning, Post Assessment Review Process reflection after testing, student success weekly meetings (MTSS), increased tutoring options
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Short term cycle allow intentional remediation, data dialogue offers targeted investigation into student progress yielding opportunity to effectively plan and design support. Increased collaboration time and expectation supports collective approach to lesson design and increased oversight of student success, coupled with standard aligned teacher created activities.

Action Steps to Implement

Staff scheduled appropriately, PLC/CLT weekly training, common planning time, CFA creation, data dialogues, regular assessment intervals

Person Responsible	Jay Blavatt (blavatj@martinschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Decline in student achievement in 2021, below MCSD average in prior years
Measurable Outcome:	Increase overall student achievement from 2021, to 2018 scores of 55% achievement
Monitoring:	Administrative oversight in CLT process, data dialogues, cfa's
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrew Connolly (connola@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	common planning, CLTs, aligned textbooks, resources and scope and sequence, APM tests, Post Assessment Review Process (PARP), intensive reading class support, ELL reading support, ESE support facilitators
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Unified textbook and resources followed with fidelity will insure that activities and lessons will be taught to the level of the standard. Common planning insures increased collaboration. CFAs allow common data points evaluated during data dialogue sessions.

Action Steps to Implement

Insure students are scheduled appropriately, prior data is shared with teachers, increased collaboration time to evaluate learning materials and student performance , then design remediation and enhancements.

Person Responsible	Andrew Connolly (connola@martinschools.org)

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.

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.

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00