J. D. Parker School Of Technology

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

J. D. Parker School Of Technology

1010 SE 10TH ST, Stuart, FL 34996

martinschools.org/o/jdpes

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Riviotta

Start Date for this Principal: 6/17/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (51%) 2014-15: C (53%)
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	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

J. D. Parker School Of Technology

1010 SE 10TH ST, Stuart, FL 34996

martinschools.org/o/jdpes

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Provide an engaging, nurturing environment where all students are encouraged to identify and fortify their strengths, motivated to take risks in their learning, and inspired to become lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Flexible and engaged learners who become critical thinkers now and for the future.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jones, Christopher	Principal	Facilitate the implementation of the school-wide instructional program as indicated within the School Improvement Plan. This includes monitoring instructional practices and student outcomes; providing guidance, direction, and feedback to students, staff, and families; and taking action to address areas of weakness evidenced within our performance data.
Rathnaw, Nicole	Assistant Principal	The role of the Assistant Principal is to support the mission and vision outlined in the School Improvement Plan. My support will mirror efforts to monitor instructional practices and student outcomes; providing guidance, direction, and feedback to all stakeholders. Student data will be the focus of all problem-solving and action planning conversations. Also, the role of Assistant Principal is to support a hospitable school climate that is safe, cooperative and collaborative to all students, staff, and families. The role also calls for identifying and cultivating instructional leadership opportunities among staff members. Multiplying leadership roles within instructional staff will enable teachers to learn and teach at their best.
Gil, Lesly	Instructional Coach	My role as Literacy Coach is to support the mission and vision outlined in the School Improvement Plan. I help teachers to recognize what they know and can do, assist teachers as they strengthen their ability to make more effective use of what they know and do, and support teachers as they learn more and apply their learning.
Gallo, Emily	School Counselor	My role as the School Counselor is to support the mission and vision outlined in the School Improvement Plan. I assist students, teachers, and parents through a variety of needs ranging from teaching social skills and character development to coordinating efforts to distribute school supplies and holiday support. I am also heavily involved with the organization of MTSS and the implementation of academic, behavioral, and attendance interventions.
Lubeno, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	My role as the Instructional Problem Solving Coach is to support the mission and vision outlined in the School Improvement Plan. I foster the development, implementation and assessment of individualized education plans for students with disabilities. I monitor the progress of each student, support learning and other needs in order to ensure that they are likely to achieve academic success. I also contribute to problem solving in the MTSS process and support instruction for students receiving Tier III interventions.
Addorisio, Jessica	Instructional Coach	My role as Literacy Coach is to support the mission and vision outlined in the School Improvement Plan. I help teachers to recognize what they know and can do, assist teachers as they strengthen their ability to make more effective use of what they know and do, and support teachers as they learn more and apply their learning.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	93	88	92	122	113	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	599
Attendance below 90 percent	18	20	27	28	22	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	7	6	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide assessment	2	2	1	12	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	2	2	1	12	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	4	10	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
40

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 8/22/2019

Prior Year - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	11	2	14	12	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	1	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	1	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Attendance below 90 percent	11	2	14	12	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	1	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

(Grade Level column header spans K–12)

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	43%	58%	57%	50%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	59%	58%	56%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	56%	53%	48%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	54%	65%	63%	56%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	65%	62%	55%	67%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	53%	51%	44%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	58%	53%	48%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	93 (0)	88 (0)	92 (0)	122 (0)	113 (0)	91 (0)	599 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	18 (11)	20 (2)	27 (14)	28 (12)	22 (6)	23 (14)	138 (59)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (2)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (3)
Course failure in ELA or Math	4 (0)	7 (0)	6 (0)	12 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	31 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	2 (0)	2 (0)	1 (1)	12 (3)	9 (2)	14 (6)	40 (12)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	42%	54%	-12%	58%	-16%
	2018	63%	57%	6%	57%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	57%	-22%	58%	-23%
	2018	44%	55%	-11%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
05	2019	46%	55%	-9%	56%	-10%
	2018	51%	58%	-7%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	58%	-7%	62%	-11%
	2018	70%	63%	7%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	67%	-16%	64%	-13%
	2018	50%	64%	-14%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
05	2019	56%	64%	-8%	60%	-4%
	2018	61%	64%	-3%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	48%	53%	-5%	53%	-5%
	2018	47%	54%	-7%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	28	33	29	48	52	45	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
ELL	29	38	33	56	65	67	41				
BLK	23	40	47	38	64	61	33				
HSP	37	34	31	56	62	61	41				
MUL	60			60							
WHT	63	59		64	60		65				
FRL	35	47	50	48	58	58	45				

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	30	42	35	31	44	33	33				
ELL	46	59	55	56	49	47					
BLK	27	34	33	32	42	41	17				
HSP	52	60	54	60	57	43	38				
MUL	50			60							
WHT	69	62	40	75	79	64	67				
FRL	53	55	45	60	63	47	48				

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	31	46	44	38	45	44	32				
ELL	36	48	43	39	42	45	25				
BLK	27	44	41	31	32	44	16				
HSP	42	54	41	47	52	50	38				
MUL	58			67							
WHT	67	66		74	66		72				
FRL	41	52	47	48	50	43	35				

ESSA Data

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
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	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	405
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	47
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
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	46
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	60
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	
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	62
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	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Achievement in ELA showed the overall the lowest score. The score represented declines in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades. Lower scores were also reflected when performance at each grade level were compared to the state and district averages.

The score was reflective of a historically lower performing cohort in 3rd grade, a change in our prior promotion/retention plan for rising 2nd and 3rd graders, and increased cognitive demand for students in 4th grade that teachers worked unsuccessfully to overcome. Supports including: the addition of interventionists to support struggling readers; added time with research proven web based remediation; data dialogues and planning sessions between administrators coaches, and teachers were provided. After FSA testing a majority of 3rd grade students who scored Level 1 were promoted to 4th through Good Cause Exemption for reasons including time in an exceptional education setting or a passing score on an alternate assessment.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Both proficiency and learning gains showed the most significant decline from 2018 to 2019. The factors reported above were factors that contributed to ELA being the lowest component and to the associated decline in the same area. JDP's high mobility rate is an added factor that contributes to our score variance from year to year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The largest discrepancy existed between JDP and the state average in ELA proficiency (-14%) and ELA Learning Gains (-12) as noted above. ELA L25 and Math achievement were 8 and 9 percentage points lower than the state respectively as well.

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

Math L25 showed the most improvement in 2019. JDP improved 12 percentage points and exceeded the state average. Students in this area were provided intensive standards-based interventions that were determined by their individual performance in math. Pre and post tests were administered to determine their progress between formal diagnostics.

Students in our African American subgroup improved in ELA. They were dismissed from our ESSA TS&I list for 2019. Students with Disabilities also improved in ELA. This group was one percentage point away from being dismissed from the TS&I list as well. Data monitoring of progress toward standards-mastery was used to track progress for students in these subgroups and determine instructional next steps throughout the year. Specific language development (vocabulary, phonics, phonemic awareness) and reading comprehension activities were implemented to elevate reading and writing skills.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance is the largest area of concern noted in EWS. There is a high correlation between student-specific absenteeism and low/failing test scores. Overall our school-wide attendance is typically over 90%, however there is a connection between the students who have chronic absences, high mobility rates and poor academic performance.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Improve reading proficiency rates across grade levels through increased attention to the rigor required by student in order for them to master grade-level standards. Learning gains across grades and subgroups are expected to occur in conjunction with increased proficiency.
2. Improve math proficiency rates and learning gain scores through increased attention to gaps demonstrated by students relative to grade-level standards.
3. Improve attendance rates for students that demonstrate chronic absenteeism and for all students school-wide.
4. Increase our rates of proficiency in science.
5. Increase the number of students with disabilities who achieve grade level proficiency.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Improved Reading Proficiency
Rationale	The percent of students demonstrating reading proficiency declined across grade levels from 2018 to 2019. The percent of students making learning gains in reading also declined in the same time period. We have seen a trend of languishing scores in first and fourth grades over several years. A persistent achievement gap exists between white students and students who are black and Hispanic. Gaps also exist between students who have identified learning disabilities and those who do not; and between students who are English Language Learners and those who are not.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of students across all subgroups demonstrating grade level reading proficiency will increase by at least five percentage points in reading. Learning Gains and L25 learning gains will also reflect a five percent increase. Our larger goal will be to return our percent of proficient and percent learning gains to 2018 scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christopher Jones (jonesc@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers across all grade levels will work collaboratively in PLC teams to: 1. Establish, track, and support the achievement of SMART goals for student achievement. 2. Implement the reading and writing units of study for grade level instruction of the Florida Standards. 3. Collaborate to analyze student performance data relative to the standards and design small group lessons to increase student proficiency rates. 4. Implement research based interventions to close achievement gaps. 5. Reflect on their instructional practices and refine instruction based on feedback from peer and administrative observations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research suggests that Collective Teacher Efficacy is a highly effective practice. The Reading and Writing Units of Study have been shown to effectively develop literacy skills. Data from Orton-Gillingham programs and Leveled Literacy Intervention have shown high success rates as intervention programs for developing phonics, phonemic awareness (OG) and vocabulary,language and comprehension development (LLI)

Action Step	
Description	1. Create master schedules for each grade level and team to ensure maximized instructional time within the ELA block. 2. Implement the Reading Units of Study, Writing Units of Study for core instruction and Fundations (K-3) and Words their Way (4-5), iReady, Leveled Literacy Intervention, Imagine Learning, and Spire for instructional support as needed. 3. Assign formative assessments of power standards within each unit of study to determine the effectiveness of instruction relative to the standards. 4. Conduct PLC team meetings twice weekly; require data collection and analysis (including subgroup data), require the creation of small group lesson plans to meet the differentiated needs of students to ensure they make progress and ultimately master the standards. 5. Provide coaching and support for teachers to ensure that effective instruction and learning are occurring in all classrooms.

Person Responsible	Lesly Gil (gill@martin.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Improved Math Proficiency
Rationale	The percent of students demonstrating math proficiency declined across grade levels from 2018 to 2019. The percent of students making learning gains in math also declined in the same time period. Students in 4th grade demonstrated declining learning gains in 2019 as well. A persistent achievement gap exists between white students and students who are black and Hispanic. Gaps also exist between students who have identified learning disabilities and those who do not.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of students across all subgroups demonstrating grade level reading proficiency will increase by at least five percentage points in reading. Learning Gains and L25 learning gains will also reflect a five percent increase. Our larger goal will be to return our percent of proficient and percent learning gains to 2018 scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christopher Jones (jonesc@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers across all grade levels will work collaboratively in PLC teams to: 1. Establish, track, and support the achievement of SMART goals for student achievement 2. Implement My Math (K-2), Go Math (3-5) Number Talks, and Project Based Learning to ensure effective core instruction of grade level instruction of the Florida Standards 3. Collaborate to analyze student performance data relative to the standards and design small group lessons to increase student proficiency rates 4. Implement research based interventions to close achievement gaps 5. Reflect on their instructional practices and refine instruction based on feedback from peer and administrative observations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research suggests that Collective Teacher Efficacy is a highly effective practice. Tracking student performance data relative to the Florida Standards will help teachers recognize gaps in understanding.
Action Step	
Description	1. Meet bi-weekly to analyze common formative assessments. 2. Organize students into small groups to provide standards based instruction differentiated to their level: aligning resources, time, and data tracking. 3. Review progress across grade level and content specific teachers. 4. Submit small group lesson plans to obtain feedback from coaches and administration. 5.
Person Responsible	Christopher Jones (jonesc@martin.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Improved Science Proficiency
Rationale	The percent of students demonstrating proficiency in science has become stagnant. Students and teachers engage in science instruction and learning that is hands-on, engaging, and relevant. However, time is a challenge for teachers across grade levels and direct instruction of science content has not been prioritized. The development of content specific vocabulary and the conceptual understanding of the scientific process are areas of need at J.D. Parker.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Science proficiency rates will increase four percentage points to 53% or more students demonstrating a score of Level 3 or higher on the Florida Science Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christopher Jones (jonesc@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers across grade levels will be required to set aside and effectively use specific time for instruction, assessment, and data collection/analysis in science. Teachers will work together within and across grade levels to plan instruction based on the requirements outlined in the standards and individualized student needs identified in assessment data. Students will participate in effective core instruction and supplemental learning as needed to ensure concept attainment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research shows that use of formative data to design instruction is highly likely to result in effective and meaningful instruction. Collaborative teacher planning has also been found to result in improved student outcomes. The core and supplemental instructional materials have been found effective locally and across the state.

Action Step	
Description	1. Foster a deeper understanding of science concepts and vocabulary through the addition of IXL at 4th grade 2. Require a specific science block of instruction (previously a STEM Block) at all grade levels. 3. Implement supplemental instruction of science concepts and vocabulary through Science Boot Camp and IXL in 5th grade 4. Continue to provide hands-on science instruction during Science Lab during related arts classes. Add science instruction through technology, direct instruction and practice in the media center and the computer lab during related arts classes for 5th grade students. 5. Increase the frequency of formative data collection. Use the data to drive small group instruction 6. Conduct Learning Walks in Science to ensure that core science instruction is occurring with fidelity.
Person Responsible	Christopher Jones (jonesc@martin.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

School-wide professional learning communities will meet twice a week. First to review and organize data; next to to respond to data and develop small group lesson plans. Each team will be support by an administrator, instructional coach or district instructional support professional.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

J.D. Parker will build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by planning strategic, meaningful events at various times throughout the school year. Those events include a Literacy Night, a STEM Night, a field trip to our local airport, and others.

PFEP Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

J.D. Parker hosts one pre-school class for students with developmental disabilities and a Title I all-day VPK. We maintain regular communication with other local pre-schools and head start programs to support transition each year through kindergarten readiness screenings. The data from these screenings are shared with the pre-school and head start partners. Our on-site pre-school teacher plans with our Kindergarten team regularly throughout the school year and conducts articulation meetings regarding each child transitioning to kindergarten from pre-K at the start of the year. Kindergarten teachers at JDP also collaborate with teachers and directors from the local pre-school programs to share "best instructional practices" and assess students who are about to transition to JDP.

J.D. Parker shares the data of fifth graders rising to sixth grade with our feeder middle schools. Reading, Math, Science and intervention support data is provided each year in a variety of manners. We also promote Stuart and Anderson Middle Schools' orientation meetings and host an on-site student training provided by the staff from Stuart Middle each year.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

The Leadership Team meets weekly to discuss concerns specific to struggling students and to help design intervention plans. The purpose of the team is to be an effective problem-solving group that:
- Assesses teachers' concerns related to student academic and/or behavioral needs
- Identifies student strengths, interests, and talents
- Reviews data
- Sets outcome goals and methods for measuring progress
- Designs specific intervention plans
- Reviews and monitors intervention plans
- Communicates progress with stakeholders

Teachers are provided funds from the discretionary budget to purchase supplies for their classrooms.

School staff members will continue to facilitate classroom adoptions in collaboration with the Education Foundation of Martin County until each teacher/classroom has been adopted by a community partner.

Title I and SAC funds will be allocated to provide teachers with professional development in literacy, science and math.

Title I and SAC funds will be used to enhance the literacy and STEM resource rooms. An emphasis will be placed on high-interest/high-effect manipulative materials that support authentic engagement.

Capital funds will be used to purchase materials that support collaborative learning such as classroom carpets, bookshelves/bins, easels, etc for classroom libraries, science lab supplies and equipment, and interactive technology.

District support through Title X to support our growing homeless population in the community and at school.

Community partnerships will also be used to support the "Backpack Buddies" program so that our homeless and indigent students will have nutrition provided to them after school and on weekends.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Our partnership with the local airport highlights many career opportunities in the field of aviation. We also bring in local business partners to participate in events, read to students, and volunteer.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

The school maintains relationships with several local businesses including the Martin County Airport. Field trips are arranged to the airport to increase student interest in related careers and foster a deeper understanding of academic concepts related to aviation.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improved Reading Proficiency				$33,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0051 - J. D. Parker School Of Technology	Title, I Part A		$25,000.00
			Notes: Professional development in guided reading, ELL instructional support strategies, language acquisition, and assessment.			
	5100	510-Supplies	0051 - J. D. Parker School Of Technology	Title, I Part A		$8,000.00

		Notes: Additional Fundations materials for 3rd grade students demonstrating deficiencies in phonics and phonemic awareness.				
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Improved Math Proficiency**				**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Improved Science Proficiency**				**$6,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	529-Technology-Related Textbooks	0051 - J. D. Parker School Of Technology	Title, I Part A		$3,000.00
		Notes: Instructional technology (IXL) to foster the development of science vocabulary in 4th and 5th grades.				
	5100	510-Supplies	0051 - J. D. Parker School Of Technology	Title, I Part A		$3,000.00
		Notes: Science Bootcamp to increase students time with hands-on learning in science. These science experiments and inquiry based projects will help students conceptualize the content they learn about in their direct instruction.				
					Total:	**$39,000.00**