Martin County School District

Willoughby Learning Center

2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Willoughby Learning Center

5150 SE WILLOUGHBY BLVD, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/wlc

Demographics

Principal: Debra Stull

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2022

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	Alternative
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Unsatisfactory 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Maintaining 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: Maintaining
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Willoughby Learning Center is to:
• Provide a learning environment that respects the dignity of every student.
• Develop the unique gifts of each student ensuring the achievement of each and every individual's extraordinary purpose.
• Expand opportunities through individualized instruction in collaboration with community resources.
• Explore all possibilities to reach the highest expectations for our student's success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Explore all possibilities for students to succeed

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

Students at Willoughby Learning Center are in grades Kindergarten to Twelfth grade Students attend due to ESE placement, behavioral placement, or placed due to academic acceleration needs. Willoughby provides support personnel in each classroom, contracted counseling services in house, intervention staff to support the students academic and behavioral needs, a support facilitator dedicated to students with ESE services, behavioral staff to assist in the maintaining behavioral plans and an English Language Learner paraprofessional to assist with services to students learning English.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stull, Debra	Principal	School Administrator
Jackson, Desiree	Teacher, ESE	Intervention Teacher
Bartsch, Lani	Teacher, ESE	Elementary Unit Teacher
Raimo, Makayla	Administrative Support	Principal Secretary
Lebeau, Nancy	Behavior Specialist	Behavior Tech

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 8/25/2022, Debra Stull

Total number of students enrolled at the school.
39

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.
10

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?
8

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?
1

Number of teachers with ESE certification?
7

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2022-23

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	12	14	3	0	0	4	39
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	7	6	1	0	0	3	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	6
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	1	7	11	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	0	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	1	1	3	12	14	3	0	0	4	39

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	4	0	0	0	0	1	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/22/2022

2021-22 - 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	17	26	58	1	1	2	4	109
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	19	45	1	1	2	3	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	17	37	0	0	2	1	67
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	25	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	31	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	33	1	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	14	25	1	0	0	0	48

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	12	22	48	1	0	2	1	86

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	1	16	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	0	0	1	1	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	2022 School	2022 District	2022 State	2021 School	2021 District	2021 State	2019 School	2019 District	2019 State
ELA Achievement		45%	55%					33%	61%
ELA Learning Gains								46%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								44%	54%
Math Achievement		33%	42%					61%	62%
Math Learning Gains								64%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								54%	52%
Science Achievement		53%	54%					31%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		62%	59%					95%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	0%	54%	-54%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	0%	57%	-57%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	57%	-57%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	62%	-62%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	0%	58%	-58%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	0%	67%	-67%	64%	-64%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019	0%	64%	-64%	60%	-60%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	64%	-64%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	60%	-60%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	67%	-67%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	58%	-58%	48%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	38%	74%	-36%	67%	-29%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	78%	-78%	70%	-70%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	7%	75%	-68%	61%	-54%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	65%	-65%	57%	-57%

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		36		16	29						
ELL		20			18						
HSP		25		7	17						
FRL		26		10	24						
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	12	17		10	7		27				
FRL	11	18		6	11						

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	10	35									
WHT	16	31					20				
FRL	11	38		7							

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	9
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	52
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	79%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	8
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	8
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	10
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	3

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?

The area of focus was increasing the number of economically disadvantaged students meeting the required promotion requirements of 8th grade (middle school). Monthly leadership meetings were conducted to monitor the progression of requirements to meet high school promotion.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

There was a large amount of 8th grade students retained in 2021-2022 school year. Monitoring the progress did not influence the pass rate for students.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

Students completion of coursework with a passing grade and the transferring of knowledge to show skill mastery on summative assessments.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Lack of engagement and work completion, specifically among the students that are here on behavior contracts.

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

Have the meetings regarding completion with the students present, provide them a stake in the monitoring of their work and educational pathway.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will participate in professional development related to the core instruction in reading and math. Additionally, the staff will participate in PBIS training to help to ensure students understand expectations. Teachers will continue to build relationships.

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Students do not have any accountability in their learning pathway. Making sure the student knows the expectations, where they are, and what supports are in place to assist them will increase the students engagement and feeling of support throughout the school day.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Monitoring the students progress in Edgenuity and tracking the intervals of growth through engagement and academic performance. Linking the progress to the pathway meetings with instructional staff and support provided through intervention sessions.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The area of focus will be monitored through Edgenuity. (Grades and on track progress.)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debra Stull (stulld@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Providing accountability, and expectation information to the student allowing the student to work alongside the instructional staff.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Students work on their assignments, but do not understand nor are they able to keep track of their progress. This method will help the student and the instructional staff work as a team to accomplish the goals of 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Monitoring ESSA Impact: If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.	This area of focus is linked to all student subgroups at Willoughby.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	A large majority of the students at WLC do not show proficiency in Reading. WLC has created an intensive reading block that provides instruction through a support program as well as independent reading time for students to have a joy of reading as they increase their understanding and reading fluency. Provide professional development to teachers related to strategies and structure surrounding ELA.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Increased progress in ELA coursework. Classwork and lesson observations and checks on strategies surrounding ELA and overall reading improvement.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Through ELA grades and course progress. Student grades, teacher lesson plans, and classroom activities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debra Stull (stulld@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers working with instructional program and providing one-on-one intervention lessons when indicated.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	This strategy is in line with the district initiative for reading intervention.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

| **Monitoring ESSA Impact:**
If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index. | All students that earned a 1 on the ELA FSA for 2022 assessment is enrolled in this class. This group represents all subgroups in our school. |

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Data shows that students are not successful in obtaining passing scores in Math assessments, nor do they complete coursework related to Math or if they do complete the coursework they do not score above 60%.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increased progress in Math coursework and progress monitoring assessments.
Classwork and lesson observations and checks on strategies surrounding Math and overall math skill improvement.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Monitoring through Edgenuity, classwork and progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Students that need intervention receive one-on-one instructional small groups and we have recently started using a math intervention program for basic math skills and algebra skills. Students will utilize this program to increase understanding while providing more practice.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Students work on computer coursework with teachers providing supplemental instruction in small groups. This intervention program will develop detailed information regarding gaps in knowledge and instructional practice to fill them.

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.

Math instructional staff (Copper) is being trained with Image Math and will provide program to students that are struggling. This will be provided after coursework, small group intervention and whole group mini lessons.
Provide professional development to teachers related to strategies and structure surrounding Math.

Person Responsible

Debra Stull (stulld@martinschools.org)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:
If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

All subgroups are represented in this instructional support.

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Willoughby has no students enrolled in this grade cluster.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Willoughby has two students that are in this grade cluster. Both students are in a self-contained unit and get one-on-one instruction.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Willoughby has no students enrolled in this grade cluster.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Willoughby has two students that are in this grade cluster. Both students are in a self-contained unit and get one-on-one instruction. Students also have an IEP with goals that are monitored for positive progress.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Students also have an IEP with goals that are monitored for positive progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Bartsch, Lani, bartsc@martin.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Instructional practices are utilized through ESE strategies and instructional intervention and support materials.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The practices and programs address the need of the students and provide progress monitoring data.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
The students work and assessment data is reviewed and documented for IEP goals and school student study meetings.	Bartsch, Lani, bartsc@martin.k12.fl.us

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.

PBIS linked to classroom management strategies

Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

The school collects data through a computer based program (Class Dojo) and daily student point sheets.

Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

Students are given the information related to earning activities, prizes and other items they can purchase with their points and the days that rewards are dispersed.

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

Student daily point sheets are entered into a data program to monitor trends and goal measures. These data points are discussed during student meetings and school meetings regarding effectiveness of school-wide initiatives for improved behavior.

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.

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Create the point sheets and class dojo system. Create the list of eligible prizes and other items and events that students can work for.	Raimo, Makayla, raimom@martin.k12.fl.us
Techers and paraprofessionals keep track of the point sheets and dojo points for students. The point sheet data is entered into a spreadsheet for use during student discussion/ meetings.	Stull, Debra, stulld@martinschools.org