

Martin County School District

Martin County High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	29
Budget to Support Goals	30

Martin County High School

2801 S KANNER HWY, Stuart, FL 34994

martinschools.org/o/mchs

Demographics

Principal: Cristina Selvidge

Start Date for this Principal: 8/5/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	30

Martin County High School

2801 S KANNER HWY, Stuart, FL 34994

martinschools.org/o/mchs

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	35%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

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

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 a safe and inclusive learning environment that inspires all students to achieve their maximum potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student will graduate college and career capable.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fabrizio, Al	Principal	
Carbone, Kristin	Assistant Principal	
Cowles, Mark	Assistant Principal	
Farrell, Danielle	Instructional Coach	
Juan-Gaspar, Miguel	Teacher, K-12	
Herd, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	
Savela, Dane	Teacher, K-12	
Sawczak, Susan	Teacher, K-12	
Barrett-Baxter, Ucola	Dean	
Knob, Sherrie	School Counselor	
DeWayne, Charles	Teacher, K-12	
Parks, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	
Anderson, Jeff	Graduation Coach	
Aker, Matt	Teacher, K-12	
Kalwa, Kelloryn	Teacher, K-12	
Gracia, Chris	Teacher, K-12	
Siters, Kelli	Assistant Principal	
Graff, Lauren	Assistant Principal	
Perez, Carlos	Assistant Principal	
Wozny, Erica	Teacher, K-12	
Stuvel, Marinka	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/5/2021, Cristina Selvidge

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

35

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

121

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,326

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

26

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

18

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22**

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/5/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	629	571	541	430	2171
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	44	50	38	166
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	6	2	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	87	25	38	151
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	107	98	60	268
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	85	98	76	384
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	52	60	43	241

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	102	94	67	340

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	0	0	8	3	5	4	20

2020-21 - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	656	608	558	460	2282
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	88	85	74	314
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	22	10	4	58
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	40	7	6	119
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	34	26	5	93
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	93	102	22	362
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	108	77	23	322

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	103	84	24	329

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	3	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	6	5	20

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				59%	71%	56%	56%	69%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	59%	51%	54%	59%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	55%	42%	41%	52%	44%
Math Achievement				59%	69%	51%	53%	63%	51%
Math Learning Gains				46%	52%	48%	49%	56%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	46%	45%	48%	44%	45%
Science Achievement				74%	82%	68%	73%	82%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				80%	84%	73%	77%	76%	71%

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
09	2021					
	2019	60%	61%	-1%	55%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	55%	59%	-4%	53%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	73%	74%	-1%	67%	6%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	81%	78%	3%	70%	11%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	53%	75%	-22%	61%	-8%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	65%	-3%	57%	5%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

2021 Adaptive Progress Monitoring Assessment

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38.4		46.43
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.75		31.18
	Students With Disabilities	12.42		23.68
	English Language Learners	6.44		8.09
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28.15	19	16.67
	Economically Disadvantaged	18.06	12.41	7.34
	Students With Disabilities	11.22	6.32	6.17
	English Language Learners	10.74	8.04	4.04
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52.24	62.08	47.85
	Economically Disadvantaged	43.1	52.55	42.26
	Students With Disabilities	21.15	28.81	29.17
	English Language Learners	22.22	49.23	34
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37.94		45.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.31		30.16
	Students With Disabilities	12.34		23.08
	English Language Learners	6.81		8.79
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	27.22	18.52	16.21
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.16	12.14	7.34
	Students With Disabilities	9.47	6.59	6.41
	English Language Learners	10	6.72	4.67
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44.75		45.47
	Economically Disadvantaged	24.84		32.24
	Students With Disabilities	12.77		29.17
	English Language Learners	14.06		12.12
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14.42	13.92	15.24
	Economically Disadvantaged	7.3	6.72	6.6
	Students With Disabilities	9.68	5	10.42
	English Language Learners	3.95	3.9	5.26
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	34.44	61.04	55.33
	Economically Disadvantaged	32.41	56.3	54.24
	Students With Disabilities	19.51	38.3	34.78
	English Language Learners	21.05	53.23	35.71

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	100		100
	Economically Disadvantaged	100		100
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2.11		5.48
	Economically Disadvantaged	2.27		
	Students With Disabilities	6.45		12.5
	English Language Learners			4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	26	32	24	14	20	19	42	49		84	27
ELL	16	33	28	15	20	21	36	29		85	27
ASN	82	58					90			100	82
BLK	28	36	33	25	34	43	34	47		91	24
HSP	37	44	31	31	26	21	56	51		89	40

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
MUL	67	57		47	18		81	67		94	40
WHT	66	54	48	55	28	27	76	80		97	69
FRL	34	44	37	32	27	26	53	54		90	44
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	25	31	25	32	42	44	45	68		89	29
ELL	18	44	45	39	47	61	38	46		56	15
ASN	70	47		64	42		100				
BLK	29	40	36	38	49	48	40	61		100	30
HSP	42	49	43	47	44	49	58	67		76	38
MUL	61	57		50	33		60	83		93	38
WHT	69	60	48	68	48	52	83	88		96	69
FRL	39	45	43	45	39	47	59	68		81	40
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	27	45	45	34	48	43	62	60		80	21
ELL	13	35	38	21	40	49	27	39		35	20
ASN	73	87		60	64			70			
BLK	18	38	38	27	38	45	60	59		79	27
HSP	38	47	39	36	44	48	52	64		70	45
MUL	53	57		48	39		71	58		100	59
WHT	67	58	46	65	52	47	82	84		91	68
FRL	39	45	37	38	42	45	58	68		73	39

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	569
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
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	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
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	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

Algebra proficiency rate of 53% in 2019. Proficiency rate of 34% in 2021. Below District/State
 Geometry proficiency rate of 63% in 2019. Proficiency rate of 51% in 2021. Below District/Above State

ELA

Based on our 2019 (60% proficiency in Grade 9) and 2021 Data (51% proficiency in Grade 9)
 Below District/Above State

Based on our 2019 (55% proficiency in Grade 10) and 2021 Data (59% proficiency in Grade 10)
 Below District/Above State

Biology proficiency rate of 73% in 2019. Proficiency rate of 68% in 2021. Equal District/Above State

US History proficiency rate of 81% in 2019. Proficiency rate of 71% in 2021. Above District/Above State

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

Our Algebra 1 EOC scores continue to show the greatest gap between school average (34%) and state average (49%) as well as District Average (54%). One of the contributing factors was the remote learning option not being effective.

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

Contributing Factors: Remote learning, learning gaps of subgroup population (Hispanic, ESE, and ELL students).

New Action: All students are back to in-person learning, a focus on gap data.

Review of teacher lesson plans

Participation in Collaborative Team meetings - feedback, pacing, monitoring

Review of Unit Assessments and Common Quarterly Assessments
Parent Communication Plan
Intervention Plan

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

While all proficiency numbers dropped from 2019 scores the Biology proficiency rate was equal to the state average and above the district average, Biology proficiency rate of 73% in 2019. Proficiency rate of 68% in 2021.

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

Continued implementation of The Professional Learning Community Process
Collaborative Teams going through The Short Cycle Formative Assessment Process
Teacher use of WICOR Strategies and Cooperative Learning Structures

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

1. Professional Learning Community Process with fidelity
2. Short Cycle Formative Assessment
3. WICOR/Focused Note Taking
4. Cooperative Learning Structures
5. Culturally Relevant Teaching

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.

Short Cycle Formative Assessment/QPC's
WICOR Strategies
Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners
Classroom Cultural Building/Engagement Strategies

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

Review of teacher lesson plans
Literacy Walkthroughs
Participation in Collaborative Team meetings - feedback, pacing, monitoring
Review of APM Data (PARP process)
Review of Unit Assessments (PARP process)
Parent Communication Plan
Intervention Plan

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Subgroup Performance in All Tested Subjects; performance of students in subgroups

Description and Rationale: in tested areas for ELA and Algebra, Biology, Geometry, US History are below proficiency level. Focus on LQ25, Level 1, Level 2 improvement.

Black (2021): 28%-ELA; 25%-Math; 34%-Science; 47%-Social Studies
 Black (2019): 29%-ELA; 38%-Math; 40%-Science; 61%-Social Studies
 -Raise 28% to 33% (ELA)
 -Raise 34% to 45% (Math)
 -Raise 47% to 66% (Science)
 -Raise 47% to 66% (Social Studies)

Hispanic (2021): 37%-ELA; 31%-Math, 56%-Science, 32%-Social Studies
 Hispanic (2019): 42%-ELA; 47%-Math, 58%-Science, 67%-Social Studies
 -Raise 37% to 47% (ELA)
 -Raise 31% to 52% (Math)
 -Raise 56% to 63% (Science)
 -Raise 32% to 72% (Social Studies)

Measurable Outcome:

ESE (2021):: 25%-ELA, 14%-Math, 42%-Science, 50%-Social Studies
 ESE (2019):: 25%-ELA, 32%-Math, 45%-Science, 68%-Social Studies
 -Raise 28% to 33% (ELA)
 -Raise 34% to 45% (Math)
 -Raise 47% to 66% (Science)
 -Raise 47% to 66% (Social Studies)

ELL (2021): 16%-ELA, 15%-Math, 36%-Science, 29%-Social Studies
 ELL (2019): 18%-ELA, 39%-Math, 38%-Science, 46%-Social Studies
 -Raise 16% to 23% (ELA)
 -Raise 15% to 44% (Math)
 -Raise 36% to 43% (Science)
 -Raise 29% to 51% (Social Studies)

Monitoring:

Review of teacher lesson plans
 Participation in Collaborative Team meetings - feedback, pacing, monitoring
 Review of APM Data
 Review of Unit Assessments and Common Quarterly Assessments
 Parent Communication Plan
 Intervention Plan

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Al Fabrizio (fabriza@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Professional Learning Community Process with fidelity
2. Short Cycle Formative Assessment
3. WICOR/Focused Note Taking
4. Cooperative Learning Structures
5. Culturally Relevant Teaching

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Professional Learning Community Process with fidelity
 Team identification of essential standards, planning of instruction, development/ administering of common formative assessment, review of data, development of intervention strategies for students that don't attain proficiency.

2. Short Cycle Formative Assessment

Utilization of Short Cycle Formative Assessment Process - which includes Common Formative Assessments, Classroom assessments, Common Quarterly Assessments (district provided), analyzing data to determine next instructional steps, providing feedback to students to support learning.

3. WICOR/Focused Note Taking

Teachers incorporating WICOR strategies (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading) to support student learning. Emphasis on students taking notes that they will refer back to and use again and again.

4. Cooperative Learning Structures

Students using each other as resources for learning. Teachers may use AVID and/or Kagan strategies for grouping based on ability level.

5. Culturally Relevant Teaching

Mindfulness of the needs of students - all students are different. Break barriers with building relationships

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaborative teams to review subgroup data
2. Teachers use the Short Cycle Formative Assessment process
3. Work with district ELL Coach
4. Use of Focused Note Taking
5. Provide all ELL students with access to word-to-word dictionaries and content specific glossaries
6. Organize schedule for optimal use of Para Professionals to provide push-in support to ELL students
7. Push in support from Support Facilitators in core content classes

Person

Responsible

Al Fabrizio (fabriza@martin.k12.fl.us)

Meet with individual teachers needing additional support to implement the needed supports
Class Visit Rotation

Review our data Florida State Assessments and Adaptive Progress Monitoring (APM) Data
Unit Assessment Review Meetings

Common Quarterly Assessment Review Meetings (Algebra, Biology, Geometry, US History)
Teacher Plans based on formative assessment data

Alg I and Geometry opportunities for extended learning
SAT/ACT tutoring opportunities

Person

Responsible

Al Fabrizio (fabriza@martin.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	District Student Success Plan Student Achievement Identification, awareness, monitoring, support for LQ25 students Based on our 2019 (60% proficiency in Grade 9) and 2021 Data (51% proficiency in Grade 9) Below District/Above State Based on our 2019 (55% proficiency in Grade 10) and 2021 Data (59% proficiency in Grade 10) Below District/Above State
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement level (3.0) on the FSA ELA assessment from our 2021 proficiency rate of 51% to 65% in Grade 9. Increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement level (3.0) on the FSA ELA assessment from our 2021 proficiency rate of 59% to 64% in Grade 10.
Monitoring:	Review of teacher lesson plans Literacy Walkthroughs Participation in Collaborative Team meetings - feedback, pacing, monitoring Review of APM Data (PARP process) Review of Unit Assessments (PARP process) Parent Communication Plan Intervention Plan
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Al Fabrizio (fabriza@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Professional Learning Community Process with fidelity 2. Short Cycle Formative Assessment 3. WICOR/Focused Note Taking 4. Cooperative Learning Structures 5. Culturally Relevant Teaching 1. Professional Learning Community Process with fidelity Team identification of essential standards, planning of instruction, development and administering of common formative assessment, data review-LQ25, development of intervention strategies for students below proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	2. Short Cycle Formative Assessment Utilization of Short Cycle Formative Assessment Process - which includes Common Formative Assessments, Classroom assessments, Common Quarterly Assessments (district provided), analyzing data to determine next instructional steps, providing feedback to students to support learning. 3. WICOR/Focused Note Taking Teachers incorporating WICOR strategies (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading) to support student learning. Emphasis on students taking notes that they will refer back to and use

again and again.

4. Cooperative Learning Structures

Students using each other as resources for learning. Teachers may use AVID and/or Kagan strategies for grouping based on ability level.

5. Culturally Relevant Teaching

Mindfulness of the needs of students - all students are different. Break barriers with building relationships

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Learning Plan: WICOR Strategies, Data Protocols, Tier 1 Intervention Strategies, Classroom Community Engagement strategies, Cooperative Learning Structures. Assessing the needs of the collaborative teams and providing targeted Professional Learning based on those needs.

Intentional Planning (based on availability of substitute teachers)

Short Cycle Formative Assessment where proficiency of the standard is at the core of the lesson.

Collaborative team process and all elements of the learning cycle driven by the PLC Coalition.

Tutoring

Intervention plan based on class and district data through the Collaborative Team process

implementing the new textbooks with fidelity, implementing Lexia with fidelity

SAT/ACT tutoring opportunities

Person Responsible AI Fabrizio (fabriza@martin.k12.fl.us)

Literacy Walkthroughs and Literacy Team

Person Responsible AI Fabrizio (fabriza@martin.k12.fl.us)

Professional Learning Plan: WICOR Strategies, Data Protocols, Tier 1 Intervention Strategies, Classroom Community Engagement strategies, Cooperative Learning Structures. Assessing the needs of the collaborative teams and providing targeted Professional Learning based on those needs.

Person Responsible AI Fabrizio (fabriza@martin.k12.fl.us)

Review our data Florida State Assessments and Adaptive Progress Monitoring (APM) Data Unit Assessment Review Meetings
Teacher Plans based on formative assessment data

Person Responsible AI Fabrizio (fabriza@martin.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	District Student Success Plan Student Achievement Identification, awareness, monitoring, support for LQ25 students Algebra proficiency rate of 53% in 2019. Proficiency rate of 34% in 2021. Below District/State Geometry proficiency rate of 63% in 2019. Proficiency rate of 51% in 2021. Below District/Above State
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement level (3.0) on the Algebra end-of-course assessment from our 2021 proficiency rate of 34% to 58%. Increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement level (3.0) on the Geometry end-of-course assessment from our 2021 proficiency rate of 51% to 68%.
Monitoring:	Review of teacher lesson plans Participation in Collaborative Team meetings - feedback, pacing, monitoring Review of Unit Assessments and Common Quarterly Assessments Parent Communication Plan Intervention Plan
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	AI Fabrizio (fabriza@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Professional Learning Community Process with fidelity 2. Short Cycle Formative Assessment 3. WICOR/Focused Note Taking 4. Cooperative Learning Structures 5. Culturally Relevant Teaching 1. Professional Learning Community Process with fidelity Team identification of essential standards, planning of instruction, development, administering of common formative assessment, review of data including LQ25, development of intervention strategies for students below proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	2. Short Cycle Formative Assessment Utilization of Short Cycle Formative Assessment Process -including Common Formative Assessments, Classroom assessments, Common Quarterly Assessments (district provided), analyzing data to determine next instructional steps, providing feedback to students to support learning. 3. WICOR/Focused Note Taking Teachers incorporating WICOR strategies (Writing, Inquiry, Comprehension, Organization, and Reading) to support student learning. Emphasis on students taking notes that they will refer back to and use again and again. 4. Cooperative Learning Structures Students using each other as resources for learning. Teachers may use AVID and/or Kagan strategies for grouping based on ability level.

5. Culturally Relevant Teaching

Mindfulness of the needs of students - all students are different. Break barriers with building relationships

Action Steps to Implement

Review our data Florida State Assessments

Common Quarterly Assessment Review Meetings (Algebra, Geometry)

Teacher Plans based on formative assessment data

Alg I and Geometry opportunities for extended learning

SAT/ACT tutoring opportunities

Person

Responsible

Al Fabrizio (fabriza@martin.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Biology: Although student proficiency remained at 73% in 2019 and was well above the state average we dropped to 68% in 2021. This was above the district proficiency level but below the state level.</p> <p>The school will work to continue to see gains in the ELL, SWD, Black, and Hispanic student population. Evidence based strategies being used include: short cycle formative assessment, focused note-taking, culturally relevant teaching, and flexible grouping. The Biology Collaborative Team will track and review student subgroup data through formative and summative assessment data and implement directed differentiation, remediation, and enrichment as needed as identified. Proficiency Equal District/Above State.. Focus on LQ25, Level 1, Level 2 improvement.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement level (3.0) on the Biology end-of-course assessment from our 2021 proficiency rate of 68% to 78%.</p>
Monitoring:	<p>Review of teacher lesson plans Participation in Collaborative Team meetings - feedback, pacing, monitoring Review of Unit Assessments and Common Quarterly Assessments Parent Communication Plan Intervention Plan</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Al Fabrizio (fabriza@martin.k12.fl.us)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Learning Community Process with fidelity 2. Short Cycle Formative Assessment 3. WICOR/Focused Note Taking 4. Cooperative Learning Structures 5. Culturally Relevant Teaching <p>1. Professional Learning Community Process with fidelity Team identification of essential standards, planning of instruction, development, administering of common formative assessment, review of data including LQ25, development of intervention strategies for students below proficiency.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>2. Short Cycle Formative Assessment Utilization of Short Cycle Formative Assessment Process -including Common Formative Assessments, Classroom assessments, Common Quarterly Assessments (district provided), analyzing data to determine next instructional steps, providing feedback to students to support learning.</p> <p>3. WICOR/Focused Note Taking Teachers incorporating WICOR strategies (Writing, Inquiry, Comprehension, Organization, and Reading) to support student learning. Emphasis on students taking notes that they will refer back to and use again and again.</p> <p>4. Cooperative Learning Structures</p>

Students using each other as resources for learning. Teachers may use AVID and/or Kagan strategies for grouping based on ability level.

5. Culturally Relevant Teaching

Mindfulness of the needs of students - all students are different. Break barriers with building relationships

Action Steps to Implement

Review our data Florida State Assessments
Common Quarterly Assessment Review Meetings (Biology)
Teacher Plans based on formative assessment data

Person Responsible AI Fabrizio (fabriza@martin.k12.fl.us)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>US History: Although student proficiency increased to 80% in 2019 and was well above the state average but dropped to 71% in 2021. This was above the state and district proficiency level. The school will work to continue to see gains in the ELL, SWD, Black, and Hispanic student population. Evidence based strategies being used include: short cycle formative assessment, focused note-taking, culturally relevant teaching, and flexible grouping. The US History Collaborative Team will track and review student subgroup data through formative and summative assessment data and implement directed differentiation, remediation, and enrichment as needed as identified. Focus on LQ25, Leve1, Level 2 improvement.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Increase the percentage of students scoring at achievement level (3.0) on the Biology end-of-course assessment from our 2021 proficiency rate of 69% to 86%.</p>
Monitoring:	<p>Review of teacher lesson plans Participation in Collaborative Team meetings - feedback, pacing, monitoring Review of Unit Assessments and Common Quarterly Assessments Parent Communication Plan Intervention Plan</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Al Fabrizio (fabriza@martin.k12.fl.us)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>1. Professional Learning Community Process with fidelity 2. Short Cycle Formative Assessment 3. WICOR/Focused Note Taking 4. Cooperative Learning Structures 5. Culturally Relevant Teaching</p> <p>1. Professional Learning Community Process with fidelity Team identification of essential standards, planning of instruction, development, administering of common formative assessment, review of data including LQ25, development of intervention strategies for students below proficiency.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>2. Short Cycle Formative Assessment Utilization of Short Cycle Formative Assessment Process -including Common Formative Assessments, Classroom assessments, Common Quarterly Assessments (district provided), analyzing data to determine next instructional steps, providing feedback to students to support learning.</p> <p>3. WICOR/Focused Note Taking Teachers incorporating WICOR strategies (Writing, Inquiry, Comprehension, Organization, and Reading) to support student learning. Emphasis on students taking notes that they will refer back to and use again and again.</p> <p>4.Cooperative Learning Structures Students using each other as resources for learning. Teachers may use AVID and/or Kagan strategies for grouping based on ability level.</p>

5. Culturally Relevant Teaching
Mindfulness of the needs of students - all students are different. Break barriers with building relationships

Action Steps to Implement

Review our data Florida State Assessments
Common Quarterly Assessment Review Meetings (US History)
Teacher Plans based on formative assessment data

Person Responsible AI Fabrizio (fabriza@martin.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The primary incidents that led to a student receiving a referral last year were defiance and skipping. Depending on the situation defiance could escalate to a point where a student needs to be suspended or assigned in school suspension. Over the last three years Martin County High School has focused their efforts using our Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports Team (PBIS) to reduce the number of students who receive OSS by enforcing positive behavior displayed by students during the school day. The PBIS Team reviews our discipline data monthly and organizes rewards and initiatives to help address negative behaviors such as defiance.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

MCHS also utilizes several avenues to maintain communication, increase involvement and keep parents informed of their child's progress, such as, but not limited to: FOCUS, a web-based electronic grading system reflecting up-to-date grades and attendance information, MCHS's website that includes "Alert Messages", photos of events, and school events and information. The website is continually updated with information, links and calendars to provide access to all students, parents and community members. We also use

Thrillshare to send messages home to students and parents about important information such as test dates, key events, and more. An "All Call" goes home to parents when students miss one or more classes.

Continued use of our website and social media pages to engage our students, parents, and community members and shared the world of MCHS athletics. Several social media sites have been created and is used to share information and photos as appropriate. Individual teachers and smaller groups use Remind 101, and push messages through Schoology and Google Classrooms to communicate with classes, teams, clubs and other groups.

Faculty:

Faculty Council

Meeting(s) with Union Reps

Collecting feedback from Faculty

Centralizing the communication process

Constant soliciting/collecting feedback from faculty members and taking action on the information collected.

Professional Learning focused on Relationships and building Classroom Culture

Recognizing outstanding Tiger Teachers, nominated by their peers "Golden Tiger" awards given on Early Release days.

Students:

Helping students find their why through Tiger Success/Community Building

Student Ownership for Learning

25 Athletic Programs, 33 Clubs -something for everyone

Positive messaging about student belonging, involvement, and value each day through morning announcements and "On the Prowl" news cast.

Emphasis on the positive interactions adult : student student : student

Utilization of student focus groups

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

For specific parents groups, we have hosted AVID/Cambridge Parent Nights which set out to explain the benefits and expectations of participation.

Our Guidance Department also hosts Parent Nights to provide parents with valuable information: Senior Night, Financial Literacy, FAFSA, etcetera.

Additionally, there is a Advance Placement Parent committee that works together each year to celebrate achievement in the Advance Placement Program.

Our Volunteer Coordinator works closely with school employees, club and class sponsors, and the district volunteer coordinator as a liaison to the parent volunteers. MCHS set goals to increase participation of parents participating in school events, such as, parent conferences. Parents are also essential members and decision makers on the School Advisory Council at MCHS.

There are a multitude of awards and recognition ceremonies hosted by different groups to promote student success creating a positive school culture such as Scholarship Night, National Honor Society Inductions, CNA Pinning, etc.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners				\$17,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		239-Other	0031 - Martin County High School	Other		\$17,000.00
			Notes: Faculty Attendanxe at Professional Learning Community Conference; AVID Summer Institute;			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		239-Other	0031 - Martin County High School	Other		\$3,000.00
			Notes: ACT & SAT Tutoring			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies				\$0.00
Total:						\$20,000.00