

Broward County Public Schools

Indian Ridge Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Indian Ridge Middle School

1355 S NOB HILL RD, Davie, FL 33324

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ian Murray

Start Date for this Principal: 9/1/2021

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	45%
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: A (63%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (70%)
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 Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Indian Ridge Middle School

1355 S NOB HILL RD, Davie, FL 33324

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>39%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>62%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We the staff of Indian Ridge Middle School are committed to the premise that educators, as agents of change in conjunction with the parents, business, and its community members will collaborate to foster the well bring of our students and develop highly technologically informed, self directed, life-long learners each with unique talents who actively participate in their own educational process.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We the staff of Indian Ridge Middle School are committed to the premise that educators, as agents of change in conjunction with the parents, business, and its community members will collaborate to foster the well bring of our students and develop highly technologically informed, self directed, life-long learners each with unique talents who actively participate in their own educational process.

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
Murray, Ian	Principal	Operations of the school and school/learning of students.
Birke, Karen	Assistant Principal	Student discipline, school operations, transportation, 7th-grade Assistant Principal
Ortiz, Irene	Assistant Principal	Oversees the 8th-grade students, student discipline, and school operations
Malca, David	Assistant Principal	Oversees the 6th grade students, facilities, and school operations
Donovan, Christine	School Counselor	Guidance coordinator and 8th grade counselor
Cabrera, Adrienne	School Counselor	6th grade counselor
Esposito, Gina	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Head
Vincent , Natalie	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Head
Casablanca, Alysha	Teacher, K-12	Classroom math teacher and SAC Co-Chair
Sterling, Dionne	Teacher, K-12	Classroom ELA Teacher, SEL Liaison, and SAC Co-Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 9/1/2021, Ian Murray

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

90

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,962

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

8

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

8

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	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	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	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	0
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/14/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	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	0
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	599	661	700	0	0	0	0	1960
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	48	37	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	5	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	59	51	0	0	0	0	161
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	27	64	0	0	0	0	122
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	19	13	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	14	0	0	0	0	47

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	128	99	68	0	0	0	0	295

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	30	31	0	0	0	0	0	61
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	6

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				69%	57%	54%	70%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	57%	54%	64%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	48%	47%	49%	50%	47%
Math Achievement				76%	60%	58%	79%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains				66%	58%	57%	71%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	49%	51%	54%	50%	51%
Science Achievement				63%	49%	51%	66%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				83%	71%	72%	83%	72%	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	66%	57%	9%	54%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	52%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
08	2021					
	2019	72%	59%	13%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	72%	58%	14%	55%	17%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	72%	53%	19%	54%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
08	2021					
	2019	69%	45%	24%	46%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	53%	43%	10%	48%	5%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	67%	33%	67%	33%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	83%	71%	12%	71%	12%

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	100%	61%	39%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	99%	56%	43%	57%	42%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady 6th - 8th grade ELA and Math progress monitoring data.

2020-2021

6-8 ELA Number/% Proficiency Fall Winter
 Economically Disadvantage 48% 52%
 Students With Disabilities 48% 52%
 English Language Learners 48% 52%

6-8 Math Number/% Proficiency Fall Winter
 Economically Disadvantage 26% 31%
 Students With Disabilities 26% 31%
 English Language Learners 26% 31%

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46	49	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged			N/A
	Students With Disabilities			N/A
	English Language Learners			N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	27	33	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged			N/A
	Students With Disabilities			N/A
	English Language Learners			N/A
Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48	54	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged			N/A
	Students With Disabilities			N/A
	English Language Learners			N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29	41	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged			N/A
	Students With Disabilities			N/A
	English Language Learners			N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students			N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged			N/A
	Students With Disabilities			N/A
	English Language Learners			N/A

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50	53	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged			N/A
	Students With Disabilities			N/A
	English Language Learners			N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16	17	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged			N/A
	Students With Disabilities			N/A
	English Language Learners			N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged			N/A
	Students With Disabilities			N/A
	English Language Learners			N/A

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	25	28	23	24	24	19	13	39	41		
ELL	44	45	29	43	32	27	28	58	54		
ASN	78	72	53	79	50		77	75	72		
BLK	58	49	29	46	33	27	45	72	44		
HSP	55	48	32	48	29	21	39	66	44		
MUL	67	63		57	38		60		64		
WHT	68	54	29	65	35	21	65	75	57		
FRL	52	46	30	45	29	21	38	63	43		
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	29	42	33	38	52	44	28	60	25		
ELL	43	58	53	55	63	52	44	61	31		

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	82	66	50	90	74	50	82	91	86		
BLK	60	48	42	71	60	44	42	86	47		
HSP	62	60	48	70	66	53	53	79	45		
MUL	71	64		71	70	60	73	81			
WHT	74	63	41	82	66	48	72	86	56		
FRL	59	57	46	67	62	46	52	76	40		
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	36	50	40	44	55	43	35	56	29		
ELL	43	65	59	67	69	53	42	68	22		
ASN	80	79	75	92	86	57	71	96	70		
BLK	62	61	35	65	66	43	45	86	45		
HSP	64	60	49	73	68	53	58	77	48		
MUL	76	64		84	72		73	91	63		
WHT	74	66	49	84	73	59	74	84	61		
FRL	60	57	46	70	68	53	52	77	41		

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	482
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	80%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	70
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	45
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	43
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	58
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	52
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	42
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?

FSA testing for the 2020-2021 school year was not mandatory due to the global pandemic. As a result, the data discussed will reflect only approximately 80% of the student population. The data component that showed the lowest performance for Indian Ridge is ELA lowest 25th percentile. Some contributing factors to last year's low performance are lack of shared best practices across disciplines, collaboration between PLCS, and variation/differentiation in teaching practices over the years. As a result of instructional practices not adapting to meet the needs of these diverse learners; our ELA lowest 25th percentile has slowly declined over the last three years.

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

FSA testing for the 2020-2021 school year was not mandatory due to the global pandemic. As a result, the data discussed will reflect only approximately 80% of the student population. Math learning gains was the data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year. The factors that contributed to this decline are lack of shared best practices across disciplines, collaboration between PLCS, and variation/differentiation in teaching practices over the years.

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

FSA testing for the 2020-2021 school year was not mandatory due to the global pandemic. As a result, the data discussed will reflect only approximately 80% of the student population. The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average for Indian Ridge is ELA lowest 25th percentile. Some contributing factors to last year's low performance are lack of shared best practices across disciplines, collaboration between PLCS, and variation/differentiation in teaching practices over the years. As a result of instructional practices not adapting to meet the needs of these diverse learners; our ELA lowest 25th percentile has slowly declined over the last three years.

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

FSA testing for the 2020-2021 school year was not mandatory due to the global pandemic. As a result, the data discussed will reflect only approximately 80% of the student population. The data component that had the greatest improvement when compared to the state average is the social studies achievement. The factors that contributed to this achievement are the use of district and state resources in instructional practices, collaboration among colleagues, shared best practices in PLCS.

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

FSA testing for the 2020-2021 school year was not mandatory due to the global pandemic. As a result, the data discussed will reflect only approximately 80% of the student population. As per 2018-2019 data our growing area of concern is our percent of level one students for statewide assessments.

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

1. Lowest 25th percentile in ELA and Math
2. Data Analysis
3. PLC's
4. Social Emotional 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.

Social and Emotional learning, project based learning, plc mini lessons, and other subject and technology specific district opportunities.

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

Behavioral and academic progress monitoring, ESSR support, RTI support, and district initiatives.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: FSA testing for the 2020-2021 school year was not mandatory due to the global pandemic. As a result, the data discussed will reflect only approximately 80% of the student population. As per our school's three year trend data the lowest 25th percentile in ELA and Math has been slowly declining.

Measurable Outcome: By June of 2022, SWD students will be at a rate at or above 41% FPPI. In addition, by June 2022, the lowest 25th percentile in ELA will increase from 46% to 50% as evidenced by the FSA ELA assessment. Additionally, the lowest 25th percentile in Math will increase from 51% to 54% as evidenced by the FSA Math assessment.

Monitoring: Collaboration across disciplines and grade level) and data driven chats with department heads and teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Karen Birke (karenbirke@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence-based strategies we plan to use are data analysis through Profession Learning Communities. We plan to discuss and drive instruction based off of Common Formative Assessments results. Remediation and enrichment will take place after the CFA in order to make sure the students understands the skill/standard or receives more challenging practice (enrichment) if it is evident that the student shows proficiency on the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data analysis is the most effective measurable tool used for instruction, remediation, and enrichment. The level of evidence is lowest 25th percentile which was determined by the ELA and math FSA assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

Our action steps include ongoing development of PLCs (collaboration across disciplines and grade level) and data driven chats with department heads and teachers. In addition, analysis of CFA data looking at trends in order to provide appropriate remediation or enrichment

Person Responsible Ian Murray (ian.murray@browardschools.com)

Our action steps include ongoing development of PLCs (collaboration across disciplines and grade level) and data driven chats with department heads and teachers. In addition, analysis of CFA data looking at trends in order to provide appropriate remediation or enrichment

Person Responsible Ian Murray (ian.murray@browardschools.com)

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.

Monitoring BASIS to identify disproportionalities within referrals and discipline actions, maintaining a staff representative of the student body, and implementing safety protocols and drills regularly.

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.

Our school builds a positive school culture and environment for all stakeholders by ensuring equity of voice in the development of a shared schoolwide vision, mission, values, and goals. For example, we clearly communicate at SAC/faculty/grade level meetings and PLCs and encourage the use of "safe language" developed by SEL Team stakeholders. Our aim is to create a school climate where learners feel safe to ask for help when facing adversity. Also, adult learners work collaboratively to create a rich rigorous eLearning experience for all student learners.

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

Our in-house SEL Team will provide training for staff to develop a standard level of competency for re-engagement strategies. In doing so, high expectations are established for all stakeholders as they work collectively to build learning capacity to impact student achievement. Additionally, as part of the positive behavior interventions and support systems (PBIS) R.O.A.R (Respect, Ownership, Attitude, and Responsibility) staff give tickets to students who are caught demonstrating good/positive behavior. The purpose of this program is to establish a schoolwide culture of recognizing and rewarding good behavior. Encourage students to adopt a mindset of doing what's right. When other students notice their peers being rewarded for good behavior it will hopefully motivate them to do the same.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$22,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5000	500-Materials and Supplies	3471 - Indian Ridge Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$22,000.00
					Total:	\$22,000.00