

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Martinez 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	23
Budget to Support Goals	0

Martinez Middle School

5601 W LUTZ LAKE FERN RD, Lutz, FL 33558

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Toby Johnson

Start Date for this Principal: 11/5/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	22%
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 (77%) 2017-18: A (80%) 2016-17: A (78%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough 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	0

Martinez Middle School

5601 W LUTZ LAKE FERN RD, Lutz, FL 33558

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	19%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

The faculty, staff, and community of Martinez Middle School will provide a safe and nurturing environment that encourages students to reach their maximum potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bob Martinez Middle School will foster an environment where all students thrive academically, socially, and emotionally through the collective efficacy of community stakeholders, school personnel, and students.

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
Johnson, Toby	Principal	School Principal
Chahal, Skyler	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair, Schoolwide Technology and Communications Team Leader
Costanzo, Layla	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor, Schoolwide Testing Coordinator
Choate, Lonnie	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 11/5/2019, Toby Johnson

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.*

7

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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

65

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,147

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

6

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

4

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	340	390	416	0	0	0	0	1146	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	16	35	0	0	0	0	63	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	9	0	0	0	0	25	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	0	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	11	0	0	0	0	23	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	30	18	0	0	0	0	70	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	19	30	0	0	0	0	59	
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	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	13

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	2	0	0	0	0	2	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/29/2021

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	377	386	437	0	0	0	0	1200	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	20	32	0	0	0	0	68	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	39	35	0	0	0	0	88	
Course failure in Math	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	14	15	19	0	0	0	0	48	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	19	19	0	0	0	0	60	

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	1	0	0	0	1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Students retained two or more times	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	377	386	437	0	0	0	0	1200	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	20	32	0	0	0	0	68	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	39	35	0	0	0	0	88	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	8	0	0	0	0	24	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	15	19	0	0	0	0	48	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	19	19	0	0	0	0	60	

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	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				82%	51%	54%	84%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	52%	54%	70%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	47%	47%	65%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				88%	55%	58%	89%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				75%	57%	57%	83%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				66%	52%	51%	77%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				79%	47%	51%	80%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				93%	67%	72%	88%	66%	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	83%	53%	30%	54%	29%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	80%	54%	26%	52%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
08	2021					
	2019	82%	53%	29%	56%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	84%	49%	35%	55%	29%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	89%	62%	27%	54%	35%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
08	2021					
	2019	68%	31%	37%	46%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	78%	47%	31%	48%	30%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	91%	67%	24%	71%	20%
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%	63%	30%	61%	32%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

District baseline and midyear assessments, Achieve 3000

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	47	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	35	50
	Students With Disabilities	57	56	62
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39	58	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	51	62
	Students With Disabilities	41	62	32
	English Language Learners	0	46	0

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40	55	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	32	42
	Students With Disabilities	56	64	66
	English Language Learners	0	14	14
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	72.20	63.65	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	59.50	50.98	58
	Students With Disabilities	84.60	81.33	25
	English Language Learners	52.85	32.65	40
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63	68.34	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	48.70	50.64	72
	Students With Disabilities	69.30	78.69	30
	English Language Learners	18.80	42.48	60

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47	59	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	34	40
	Students With Disabilities	61	68	70
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53.90	67.28	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	40.20	55.92	60
	Students With Disabilities	66.90	82.53	28
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63.60	53.08	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	50.40	35.48	48
	Students With Disabilities	81.40	70.65	15
	English Language Learners	16.60	15.77	0

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	28	43	39	31	38	29	22	42			
ELL	51	58	45	54	48	47	47	62	86		
ASN	86	78	50	86	70	60	87	90	100		
BLK	68	58	43	65	51	27	54	57	92		
HSP	64	54	44	62	52	40	53	73	79		
MUL	82	60		78	69	40	67	89	89		
WHT	77	61	50	82	65	51	68	89	90		
FRL	64	53	48	60	50	38	48	73	75		
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	48	54	53	49	56	48	45	62	68		
ELL	50	57	56	57	68	56		88			

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	94	82		97	86		96	100	97		
BLK	77	68		83	75	50		100			
HSP	80	68	59	83	72	71	78	86	83		
MUL	79	61	58	83	76	40	73	100	86		
WHT	82	66	58	89	75	66	79	93	86		
FRL	72	63	54	79	65	60	73	87	83		
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	43	60	56	47	67	62	32	55	64		
ELL	56	70	64	63	70	67	50				
ASN	95	87		100	100		89	93	93		
BLK	71	53	62	70	66	59	33				
HSP	80	73	68	81	79	68	76	84	86		
MUL	88	68	60	90	86	80	94	62	90		
WHT	84	69	64	90	83	81	83	89	87		
FRL	70	63	55	75	78	70	63	82	86		

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	69
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	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	685
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	58
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	79
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	57
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	59
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	72
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	70
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	57
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?

ESE students perform the lowest across campus

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

ELA and Math Lowest 25th Percentile

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

Student attendance and progress monitoring, RTI, MTSS

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

Schoolwide math achievement and learning gains

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

Tutoring sessions held before school, tutoring sessions during lunch

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

Weekly tutoring during lunch. Each subject area is assigned a day for teachers to bring students into their classrooms for remediation and acceleration. PLC meetings held twice a month for common planning and data analysis.

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.

Schoolwide professional development is held once a month. PLCs meet twice a month and have the opportunity to participate in professional development during their PLC meetings.

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

Additional tutoring before school, during lunch, Saturday School ELP, schoolwide mentoring program for students with early warning indicators.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Increasing student engagement through acceleration and small group instruction.

Measurable Outcome: Students will participate in engaging collaborative lessons that have been created using scaffolding methods and small group instruction.

Monitoring: Monthly Professional Development training sign in sheets, PLC meeting minutes

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will participate in PLC meetings twice a month to collaborate and plan lessons based on assessment data. Monthly professional development trainings will be held once a month. Teachers will utilize these strategies in their classroom lesson planning and instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The professional development trainings and PLC meetings will provide teachers with the necessary tools to incorporate reading, writing, and discussion strategies in their classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will attend monthly professional development trainings

Person Responsible Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

Teachers will participate in collaborative PLC meetings twice a month

Person Responsible Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

Administration and Subject Area Leaders will participate in classroom walkthroughs to monitor implementation of techniques from professional development trainings

Person Responsible Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase schoolwide ELA achievement by:1) establishing common language between all ELA/Reading classrooms,2) utilizing common assessment data to identify trends and provide acceleration and scaffolding when necessary

Measurable Outcome: For the 2021-2022 school year, 65% of the students in our lowest 25th percentile will make ELA gains

Monitoring: Quarterly grade reports, semester grades, common assessment data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiated instruction, student engagement, standards-based grading, SWAG (small group instruction), ELP, small group rotation model. Development, administration, and analysis of common formative assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Professional development, PLC data analysis, PSLT meetings, faculty input

Action Steps to Implement

Differentiated instruction

Person Responsible: Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

PLC meetings

Person Responsible: Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

ELP

Person Responsible: Layla Costanzo (layla.costanzo@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math gains- RTI/MTSS process will be integrated into the classroom to identify and assist students in need.
Measurable Outcome:	For the 2021-2022 school year, 70% of the students in our lowest 25th percentile will make math gains.
Monitoring:	Teachers will implement strategies focused on small group instruction and acceleration.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Think through math (Algebra support), differentiated instruction, SWAG (small group instruction), ELP, Flipped classroom mode
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data analysis of student improvement using these strategies showed growth.
Action Steps to Implement	
PLC meetings	
Person Responsible	Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)
Professional Development	
Person Responsible	Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)
Math tutoring	
Person Responsible	Layla Costanzo (layla.costanzo@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With differentiating teaching styles, students will be able to utilize metacognitive strategies that work best for their learning. Acceleration will be implemented to increase standards-based achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Schoolwide Science achievement from 66% to 72% through the implementation of collaborative lesson planning, acceleration, and common assessments.
Monitoring:	PLC meeting minutes, Administrative walkthroughs, data chats, common assessment data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Flipped classroom model, differentiated instruction, Literacy in Science, SWAG (small group instruction), ELP, inquiry-based learning projects, Brain Pop, Gizmos
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collective teacher efficacy has shown to increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

PLC Meetings held twice a month

Person Responsible	Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)
---------------------------	--------------------------------------

Common assessments

Person Responsible	Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)
---------------------------	--------------------------------------

SWAG (small group instruction)

Person Responsible	[no one identified]
---------------------------	---------------------

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Civics EOC data shows a decrease in Social Studies Achievement

Measurable Outcome: Increase schoolwide Social Studies Achievement from 84% to 90% through the implementation of collaborative lesson planning, acceleration, and common assessments.

Monitoring: Monthly PLC meetings, common assessment data, district baseline data, Administrative walkthroughs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Skyler Chahal (skyler.chahal@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Classroom lessons will integrate acceleration and grouping to support the student's application of new skills and strategies. Civics EOC Bootcamp will utilize USA Test Prep, SWAG, and other standards-based activities to increase student achievement

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Common planning, increased student achievement based on common assessments, progress monitoring, data chats, administrative walkthroughs, weekly tutoring sessions

Action Steps to Implement

EOC Bootcamp

Person Responsible Skyler Chahal (skyler.chahal@hcps.net)

PLC meetings for common planning and common assessment data analysis

Person Responsible Skyler Chahal (skyler.chahal@hcps.net)

Standards based progress monitoring

Person Responsible Skyler Chahal (skyler.chahal@hcps.net)

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.

Martinez ranks very low in safety incidents (#18 out of 553 middle schools statewide). Our safety incidents and suspensions continue to decrease. We will continue fostering a safe learning environment at our school through mentoring programs and schoolwide incentives that promote positive student interactions.

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.

Martinez Middle School will continue to build and maintain a positive school culture and environment through various methods. All community stakeholders are invited to collaborate with faculty and staff through the school PTSA and SAC. Families and community members are invited to attend monthly SAC meetings to monitor and assess the effectiveness of the School Improvement Plan. These meetings will be utilized to strengthen the relationship between our school and the community in which it serves. The PTSA is very active and plays an integral role in educating our parents. We hold curriculum and informational sessions for parents at the school both in the mornings and in the evenings throughout the year. Our school communicates with families and the community through Canvas, various district approved social media platforms, and the parent link telephone service to disseminate information to students' homes.

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

PTSA and SAC- Increase parent and community involvement and collaboration

PSLT- Schoolwide progress monitoring

Lead Team- Collaboration between subject area and grade level teams to increase schoolwide student success