

Martin County School District

Dr. David L. Anderson Middle School



2022-23 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Dr. David L. Anderson Middle School

7000 SE ATLANTIC RIDGE DR, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/ddlam

Demographics**Principal: Ebony Jarrett**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/5/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	64%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (62%)
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	ATSI
* 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Dr. David L. Anderson Middle School

7000 SE ATLANTIC RIDGE DR, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/ddlam

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	64%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	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.

Be Equitable, Be Courageous, Be Proud

Provide the school's vision statement.

All Students High School Ready Without Remediation

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McMurry, Diane	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Curriculum
Perez, Carlos	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Discipline
Borel , Darcia	Principal	
Webster, Andrew	Teacher, K-12	Math department team leader
Belvin, Tonya	Teacher, K-12	Science department team leader
Lavere, Gina	Teacher, K-12	Related Arts department team leader
Register, Kristen	Instructional Coach	
Hyde, Dino	Dean	
Falzon, Anthony	Dean	
McGrath, Susan	Teacher, K-12	ELA department team leader
Sigmon, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies department team leader

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/5/2022, Ebony Jarrett

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

46

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

62

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,046

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

15

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

15

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	358	346	330	0	0	0	0	1034
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	48	46	0	0	0	0	145
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	9	0	0	0	0	35
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	113	91	93	0	0	0	0	297
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	87	75	0	0	0	0	309
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	79	70	0	0	0	0	255

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	7	0	0	0	0	22

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/6/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	362	380	378	0	0	0	0	1120
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	43	32	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	36	25	0	0	0	0	77
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	74	64	0	0	0	0	181
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	74	61	0	0	0	0	173
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	101	78	0	0	0	0	257
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	104	114	0	0	0	0	313
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	12	5	0	0	0	0	27

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	362	380	378	0	0	0	0	1120
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	43	32	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	36	25	0	0	0	0	77
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	74	64	0	0	0	0	181
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	74	61	0	0	0	0	173
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	101	78	0	0	0	0	257
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	104	114	0	0	0	0	313
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	12	5	0	0	0	0	27

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	53%	50%				52%	62%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	43%						53%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%						48%	51%	47%
Math Achievement	51%	32%	36%				68%	74%	58%
Math Learning Gains	60%						61%	68%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						55%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	61%	53%				64%	64%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	59%	58%				70%	87%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	54%	57%	-3%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	42%	53%	-11%	52%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2022					
	2019	56%	62%	-6%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	61%	64%	-3%	55%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	53%	60%	-7%	54%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
08	2022					
	2019	65%	67%	-2%	46%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	61%	58%	3%	48%	13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	74%	-74%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	43%	77%	-34%	71%	-28%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	93%	75%	18%	61%	32%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	65%	35%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	14	30	21	21	44	46	20	52	30		
ELL	19	32	26	28	46	44	26	61	45		
ASN	73	73		93	93						
BLK	36	32	21	41	51	46	39	82	50		
HSP	32	38	29	39	54	47	37	68	59		
MUL	44	42		64	67		40	60	67		
WHT	54	51	39	66	68	62	64	82	76		
FRL	31	36	29	42	55	46	39	72	57		
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	20	33	35	31	37	33	38	52	46		
ELL	27	37	32	32	38	42	24	55	44		

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
ASN	76	65		82	65				91		
BLK	44	55	44	45	37	33	44	71	70		
HSP	35	41	36	42	40	39	44	66	59		
MUL	46	53	58	35	33	40	64	67	67		
WHT	58	55	48	64	47	52	72	87	71		
FRL	37	43	40	41	38	41	51	67	58		
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	23	47	46	44	64	65	29				
ELL	19	46	52	39	51	49	26		59		
ASN	89	90		100	65				100		
BLK	36	40	33	53	48	56	38				
HSP	39	49	51	58	59	57	53		70		
MUL	44	49		61	49	30	50		70		
WHT	63	57	49	77	65	55	74		79		
FRL	40	48	46	60	58	55	53		70		

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	512
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

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

1. AMS continues to see a drop in proficiency for 7th-grade students in ELA
2. All sub-groups demonstrating a decline.
3. White students have seen the largest overall learning gains in Math
4. From 2021 to 2022 Math scores have seen an increase in proficiency for the following subgroups, Asian, Multi-racial, and White.

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

ELA and Math proficiency scores continue to be the areas that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement across all grade levels.

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

1. AMS continues struggling to find qualified and experienced teachers in all core areas.
2. Although fully staffed in Math, most of these teachers are brand new to the profession with little to no classroom experience.
3. We currently have our intensive reading teacher out on a leave of absence
4. For math & ELA, FAST assessments will be given in August 2022 (baseline) and December 2022 & May 2023 for grades 6-8. We are also offering tiered levels of instruction in math with additional math support provided through an elective class.
5. ELA teachers will also be utilizing unit assessment data for progress monitoring regularly.

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

1. Math learning gains increased to 60% in 2022, compared to 43% in 2021.
2. There was also a growth in math of 8% in the lowest quartile compared to 2021

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

1. The math team worked collaboratively to share lesson plans and ideas, as well as monitor CQA data regularly.
2. Used IXL program data to remediate and monitor those students identified as needing support.

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

1. Students will continue to be encouraged to take Algebra in eighth grade to accelerate their learning.
2. In 7th grade, most students continue with the accelerated math course, which provides exposure to Pre-Algebra content.
3. Students who indicate a need for more support are offered a math class combined with a supporting elective class to allow them additional time to master the math standards. This practice carries over into 8th grade, for students who need additional support with Algebra.

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.

1. AMS continues to focus on AVID instructional strategies including WICOR (Writing to Learn, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading to Learn).
2. Additionally, math teachers are continuing to incorporate P.E.E.R. which focuses on the Marzano elements of "Practicing" "Examining similarities and differences" "Examining errors in reasoning" and "Revising knowledge" as a structure to help students gain a deeper understanding, particularly in math.

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

1. Continued use of an instructional coach dedicated to our school. The instructional coach assists in modeling instructional strategies, developing engaging lessons, and analyzing content. The instructional coach is instrumental in developing new teachers as well as providing ongoing support for teachers of all experience levels. Specifically, the instructional coach uses classroom walk-through data that is collected by the school's guiding coalition members and Literacy Leadership team to identify learning strategies that would benefit teachers. These strategies are presented in monthly sessions, "WICOR Wednesdays" for all teachers during the school day. These practices align with the District Success Plan: Employee Success - Goal #4: Ensuring all employees receive meaningful and relevant professional development.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The district will continue to use the same instructional materials to support the ELA classroom. This includes a pacing calendar provided by the district to align instruction district-wide. ELA teachers will ensure that the B.E.S.T. standards are presented to all students.

After school tutoring will be offered to students for support in ELA. The tutoring will begin on October 17, 2021-December 17, 2021. The positions will be highly qualified ELA teachers with additional support from bilingual staff..

This area of focus aligns with the Martin County School District's Success Plan: Student Success - Goal #1 - Academic Achievement in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA students will demonstrate an increase in proficiency of 5% as measured by unit test scores and all FAST assessments..

Monitoring:

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

FAST assessments were given in the fall of 2022 to establish a baseline. Winter 2022 FAST assessments will be used to evaluate progress. Additionally, all ELA classes will deliver Unit Assessments (UA) at the end of each quarter which will reflect progress relative to the standards taught each quarter.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diane McMurry (mcmurrd@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

1. Teachers will use the PEER instructional strategy in the ELA classroom.
2. Students who scored Level 1 on the ELA FSA in the prior year will use the Lexia Power Up reading program to help remediate reading skills in an Intensive Reading class in addition to the ELA class.
3. Students who scored Level 2 on the ELA FSA in the prior year will have a reading-centered elective class in addition to the ELA class.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

PEER comes from the Marzano evaluation tool. It incorporates the elements of Helping students PRACTICE skills, strategies & processes, Helping students EXAMINE similarities and differences, Helping students EXAMINE their reasoning and Helping students REVISE knowledge. The Unit Assessments are part of the SAVVAS curriculum, and the APM is provided by the state.

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

#2. 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.

From 2021 to 2022, students have shown learning gains in math of 17%, and 43% to 60%. We will continue to focus on improving students' scores in math and the implementation of the BEST standards.

After-school tutoring is offered to students for support in math and algebra. The tutoring will begin on October 2022-May 2023. The positions will be highly qualified math teachers with additional support from the bilingual staff.

This area of focus aligns with the Martin County School District's Success Plan: Student Success - Goal #3 - Academic Achievement in Mathematics.

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

Math students will demonstrate an increase in proficiency of 5% as measured by the 2022/2023 FAST assessments.

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

FAST assessments will be given in Fall, 2022 to establish a baseline, and in Winter 2022/23 to evaluate progress, and a final FAST assessment in May 2023.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diane McMurphy (mcmurrd@martinschools.org)

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

1. Teachers will incorporate the PEER strategy as an instructional strategy.
2. Grade-level teams will use data from FAST assessments and unit exams to guide instruction.
3. FAST will be used as progress monitoring in January 2023
4. Students who were identified by their previous years' math teacher as needing extra assistance are scheduled into math classes as a block (2 class periods with the same math teacher).
5. For students who scored a Level 1 on the prior year FSA, a Critical Thinking elective class is provided to focus on remediating math skills.

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

PEER comes from the Marzano evaluation tool. It incorporates the elements of Helping students PRACTICE skills, strategies & processes, Helping students EXAMINE similarities and differences, Helping students EXAMINE their reasoning and Helping students REVISE knowledge.

The school district provides the CQA assessments, and the APM is provided by the state.

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

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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

The population of students whose first language is not English continues to grow at a steady pace. In 2021, 136 students participated in WIDA testing. In 2022, 152 eligible ELL students are currently enrolled.

Based on 2022 data, the ELL subgroup reported 19% proficiency in ELA, with learning gains at 32% and bottom quartile learning gains at 26%.

Based on 2019 data, the ELL subgroup reported 39% proficiency in Math, with learning gains at 49% and bottom quartile learning gains at 49%.

While proficiency scores are substantially lower for ELL students compared to non-ELL students (ELA = 32% gap; Math = 26% gap), ELL students do show strong growth numbers, as reported above.

Our focus is to support ELL students to increase proficiency and growth performance by 5% in each subject area.

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

Increase ELL proficiency in ELA by 5% to 25% as measured by the 2022/23 FAST assessments.

Increase ELL proficiency in Math by 5 % to 44% as measured by the 2022/23 FAST assessments

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

Use FAST data to monitor ELL progress toward proficiency and identify areas in need of remediation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diane McMurry (mcmurrd@martinschools.org)

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

ELL support facilitators will provide assistance to students and classroom teachers to help facilitate learning for ELL students.

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

Ryan (2010) reports that "finding strategies that allow teachers to incorporate students' native languages into the classroom, even when the teacher does not speak the language, is a vital issue for educators today". Using WICOR strategies that are modified specifically for ELL students uses best teaching practices with native language support.

Reference:

Ryan, E. (2010). Using student's native languages in the classroom: Rationale and strategies for monolingual teachers. Vanderbilt University. <https://ir.vanderbilt.edu/handle/1803/3997>

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

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

NA

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

NA

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)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

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.

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

NA

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?

NA

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

NA

Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

Building a positive culture is a multi-layered approach.

- + Building common beliefs, language, and expectations
 - + Engaging in Collaborative Learning Teams
 - + Creating cross-curricular teacher teams who share the same 110 students
 - + Curriculum mapping and assessment writing
 - + Weekly communication
 - + Honoring teacher's time with differentiated professional development (T4TPD)
 - + Encourage risk-taking, reflection, and meta-cognition
 - + Using an Instructional coach to provide side-by-side support, modeling, and strategy sharing
- Teachers grow when they are trusted to make decisions, have some autonomy, and are given time to reflect on practices and decisions.

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

Stakeholders:

- + Teachers, Staff, Students, Parents, and community members

Roles:

Engagement, participation, and input. Creating vision and mission statements to lead the school's culture and performance action steps keeps every stakeholder involved as decisions makers. When people are engaged, participate, and provide input in the direction of the school, they become empowered contributors. Engaged stakeholders will leave and help share inclusive and interactive messages in the community. This model also helps develop synergy among teachers and parents. A unified team of parents and teachers is the strongest foundation of learning for students.