# Martinez Middle School



# 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# 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**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Middle School<br>6-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | No |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 22% |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: A (75%)<br><br>2018-19: A (77%)<br><br>2017-18: A (80%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Central |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Lucinda Thompson |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | N/A |
| * 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.](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

# 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) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Middle School 6-8 | No | 22% |

| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 45% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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**
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Johnson, Toby | Principal | |
| Chahal, Skyler | SAC Member | |
| Choate, Lonnie | Assistant Principal | |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Tuesday 11/5/2019, Toby Johnson

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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**
56

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**
1,161

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.**
8

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**
6

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 29 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Course failure in ELA | 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 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 25 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 29 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | |

**Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":**

| 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 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Saturday 8/27/2022

**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 | 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 |

**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 | 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 |

## 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 | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 76% | 50% | 50% | | | | 82% | 51% | 54% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 61% | | | | | | 67% | 52% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 50% | | | | | | 59% | 47% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | 83% | 36% | 36% | | | | 88% | 55% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 78% | | | | | | 75% | 57% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 67% | | | | | | 66% | 52% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 72% | 52% | 53% | | | | 79% | 47% | 51% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 89% | 58% | 58% | | | | 93% | 67% | 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 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 83% | 53% | 30% | 54% | 29% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 80% | 54% | 26% | 52% | 28% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -83% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 82% | 53% | 29% | 56% | 26% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -80% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 84% | 49% | 35% | 55% | 29% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 89% | 62% | 27% | 54% | 35% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -84% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 68% | 31% | 37% | 46% | 22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -89% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 78% | 47% | 31% | 48% | 30% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 91% | 67% | 24% | 71% | 20% |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 93% | 63% | 30% | 61% | 32% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 100% | 57% | 43% | 57% | 43% |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 24 | 32 | 27 | 38 | 62 | 60 | 19 | 71 | | | |
| ELL | 46 | 49 | 43 | 63 | 70 | 59 | 38 | 77 | 92 | | |
| ASN | 87 | 74 | 65 | 92 | 91 | 76 | 71 | 92 | 95 | | |
| BLK | 60 | 50 | 46 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 50 | 93 | | | |
| HSP | 63 | 54 | 40 | 72 | 72 | 62 | 57 | 82 | 96 | | |
| MUL | 82 | 70 | | 89 | 80 | | 90 | 90 | 93 | | |
| WHT | 80 | 61 | 55 | 86 | 78 | 70 | 77 | 91 | 96 | | |
| FRL | 57 | 49 | 43 | 66 | 67 | 59 | 56 | 82 | 90 | | |
| 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 | | | |
| 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 | | |

## ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 74 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 68 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 739 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 42 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 61 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **Black/African American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 63 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 66 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 85 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 77 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 63 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**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?**

Schoolwide Reading Achievement

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

6th, 7th, and 8th grade ELA learning gains

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

Schoolwide focus on reading strategies, common planning

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Schoolwide Math, Algebra 1 EOC, Geometry EOC

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

Common planning, math tutoring

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

Students Wanting Academic Greatness (SWAG) weekly tutoring for content area courses. Each subject area is assigned a day each week to host tutoring sessions at lunch.

**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.**

Content area PLCs, technology trainings, AVID strategies, schoolwide common reading language

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

SWAG tutoring, common planning, common assessments, demonstration classrooms, student incentives

**Areas of Focus**
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction | |
| --- | --- |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | Implementing reading strategies across all content areas to increase schoolwide ELA proficiency and achievement. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | Increase the percent of students who are proficient in reading in each grade level by implementing common reading strategies across all curriculums. |
| **Monitoring:** Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | Subject area PLC meeting notes, common assessment data, district progress-monitoring assessment data, |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. | AVID Reading Strategies, Professional Development focused on Reading in all content area classes, schoolwide common language for Reading, schoolwide tutoring |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy. | The strategies used show high efficacy rates for student achievement and learning |

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Schoolwide Common Language for Reading

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

Schoolwide Professional Development

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

PLC Meetings held twice a month for common planning, professional development, and data analysis

| **Person Responsible** | Lonnie Choate (lonnie.choate@sdhc.k12.fl.us) |
| --- | --- |

Progress monitoring and tutoring

| **Person Responsible** | Layla Costanzo (layla.costanzo@sdhc.k12.fl.us) |
| --- | --- |

## 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

**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 school culture and environment.**

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
Student Services- Student success and support services