

Martin County School District

Indiantown 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

Indiantown Middle School

16303 SW FARM RD, Indiantown, FL 34956

martinschools.org/o/ims

Demographics

Principal: Jeff Raimann

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

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)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (47%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (50%)
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

Indiantown Middle School

16303 SW FARM RD, Indiantown, FL 34956

martinschools.org/o/ims

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	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	97%

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.

We are committed to empowering, inspiring, and educating all learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

School personnel, parents, students, and community members working in collaboration to ensure success for all learners.

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
Raimann, Jeff	Principal	
Bickley, William	Assistant Principal	
Norman, Melora	Assistant Principal	
Macedo, Consuelo	Teacher, K-12	Member - Guiding Coalition
Mesorana, Matt	Teacher, K-12	Member - Guiding Coalition
Monks, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	Member - Guiding Coalition
Rivera, Denise	School Counselor	Member - Guiding Coalition
Stoner, Katy	Teacher, ESE	Member - Guiding Coalition
McKnight, Annita	Teacher, K-12	Member - Guiding Coalition
Damon, Hannah	Teacher, K-12	Member - Guiding Coalition
Soberanis, Luz	Teacher, K-12	Member - Guiding Coalition

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2011, Jeff Raimann

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.*

2

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.*

33

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

640

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

10

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

5

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	194	160	154	162	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	42	42	45	47	0	0	0	0	176
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	29	29	25	23	0	0	0	0	106
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	14	28	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	23	33	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	98	69	62	63	0	0	0	0	292
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	105	56	42	30	0	0	0	0	233
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	93	70	62	54	0	0	0	0	279

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	1	0	8	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	4	9	0	0	0	0	36

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/2/2022

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	142	167	170	191	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	47	56	49	61	0	0	0	0	213
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	19	16	23	16	0	0	0	0	74
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	23	29	0	0	0	0	96
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	18	38	0	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	72	52	63	76	0	0	0	0	263
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	69	52	47	52	0	0	0	0	220
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	71	72	66	76	0	0	0	0	285

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	7	1	7	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	9	5	0	0	0	0	29

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	142	167	170	191	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	47	56	49	61	0	0	0	0	213
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	19	16	23	16	0	0	0	0	74
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	23	29	0	0	0	0	96
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	18	38	0	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	72	52	63	76	0	0	0	0	263
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	69	52	47	52	0	0	0	0	220
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	71	72	66	76	0	0	0	0	285

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	7	1	7	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	9	5	0	0	0	0	29

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	29%	53%	50%				33%	62%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	41%						46%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%						44%	51%	47%
Math Achievement	41%	32%	36%				61%	74%	58%
Math Learning Gains	56%						64%	68%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						54%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	19%	61%	53%				31%	64%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	65%	59%	58%				95%	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	27%	57%	-30%	54%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	31%	53%	-22%	52%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
08	2022					
	2019	37%	62%	-25%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	51%	64%	-13%	55%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	55%	60%	-5%	54%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2022					
	2019	50%	67%	-17%	46%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

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	30%	58%	-28%	48%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	95%	77%	18%	71%	24%
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	88%	75%	13%	61%	27%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	95%	65%	30%	57%	38%

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	8	34	23	26	60	65	8	25			
ELL	17	35	33	28	49	52	11	40	61		
BLK	37	56	57	46	64	47	16	82			
HSP	28	40	33	40	55	54	19	63	81		
WHT	44	43		52	62		23				
FRL	31	44	40	43	57	59	18	69	80		
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	9	24	22	26	33	26	8	26			
ELL	24	37	28	38	35	36	16	36	43		
BLK	35	43	36	47	42	47	14	50	80		
HSP	29	38	28	44	38	37	22	50	46		

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
WHT	48	36		69	39		50				
FRL	32	39	28	46	37	37	24	54	51		
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	16	38	41	39	60	51	11				
ELL	18	37	41	50	61	52	19		45		
BLK	29	39	33	61	72	65	26				
HSP	32	45	44	60	63	53	30	93	66		
WHT	53	63		69	59		54				
FRL	33	46	44	61	64	56	32	94	73		

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	46
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	34
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	456
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
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	36
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	45
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	48
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?

Both ELA and Math Learning Gains, as well as ELA L25 and Math L25 grew from SY21 to SY22 (39% - 41%; 38% - 56%; 28% - 35%; 38% - 54%, respectively). Proficiency in both ELA and Math trended downward (31% - 29%; 45% - 41%, respectively). Civics gained 13 percentage points from SY21 - SY22, while Science dropped from 23% to 19% proficiency.

Current Grade 6 Cohort

ELA Achievement -2%

ELA LG -52%*

ELA LG25 -65%*

Math Achievement -8%

Math LG -62%*

Math LG25 -46%*

*WES learning gains only based on previously retained students only.

Current Grade 7 Cohort

ELA Achievement +5%

ELA LG +28%

ELA LG25 +32%

Math Achievement +1%

Math LG +28%

Math LG25 +47%

Current Grade 8 Cohort

ELA Achievement -3%

ELA LG -8%

ELA LG25 -14%

Math Achievement +12%

Math LG +37%

Math LG25 +7%

ELA achievement of students with disabilities is trending downward over a three-year period (SY19 - 16%, SY21 -9%, SY22 -8%); however, SWD ELA LGs grew by ten percentage points (24 in SY21 - 34 in SY22).

ELA achievement of ELLs fell from 24% in SY21 to 17% in SY22; further, ELL LGs dropped two percentage points (SY21 - 37% - SY22 - 35%).

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

While we've made great progress in both ELA & Math in terms of raising the percentage of students making learning gains, as well as our lowest 25th percentile learning gains, our achievement in both ELA and mathematics is trending down from 2019 to 2022. Further, our Science achievement follows this same trend (SY19 - 31%, SY21 -23%, SY22 -19%).

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

Many of our students start at IMS two or more grade-levels below proficiency. While we have made great strides in differentiating instruction, tiering tasks, and scaffolding processes to allow students to grow, we have been unable to close these achievement gaps in significant ways to impact grade-level proficiency. To do so, we must continue to use data to identify and plan to meet the needs of each student, while exposing all students to rigorous, grade-level standards.

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

ELA BQ LG +7
Math LG +18
Math BQ LG +16
Civics +13
Acceleration +28
Overall points +74 *most in District

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

Targeted focus on closing the achievement gap by identifying lowest quartile students, communicating this information with teachers, working collaboratively to create systems to track data and plan to meet the needs of each identified student.

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

Move toward increasing student agency with the following areas of focus:
Clear learning targets, every classroom, every period, every day
Create a culture of inquiry and creativity.
Emphasize relevance over engagement.
Facilitate ongoing feedback.
Writing to learn and reflect on learning
Develop a process for helping students track their progress and take ownership for closing gaps in learning.

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.

Writing to Learn - AVID/Literacy Leadership Team
"Walking Wednesday" weekly teacher-led learning walks across content areas

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

Continued monitoring through MTSS; Literacy Leadership Team to monitor literacy metrics through the school year

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.

While learning gains, and L25 learning gains improved, ELA achievement dropped from 31% to 29% in SY22.

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

Grade 5 will increase ELA achievement from 24% to 29% in SY23.

Grade 6 will increase ELA achievement from 22% to 26% in SY23.

Grade 7 will increase ELA achievement from 26% to 31% in SY23.

Grade 8 will increase ELA achievement from 36% to 40% in SY23.

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

Benchmark Advanced (5)/Savvas (6-8) unit assessments; Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) ELA: Reading

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Bickley (bicklew@martin.k12.fl.us)

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

Improve core instruction within our ELA department through Collaborative Learning

Team planning and data analysis, as well as "Walking Wednesday" teacher-led learning walks.

Literacy Leadership Team to oversee monitoring and professional learning of school-wide literacy initiatives (active reading, writing to learn).

Collaborative Learning Teams empower teachers, promote collective teacher efficacy, and facilitate planning and reflection to improve teaching and learning.

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

Use of active reading strategies and writing across content-areas will increase metacognition, reflection on learning, and student agency.

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.

Facilitate CLTs that focus on collaboration and student achievement.

Person Responsible

William Bickley (bicklew@martin.k12.fl.us)

Initiate professional learning schedule to re-visit Active Reading (annotation/metacognition strategy) and introduce Writing to Learn (AVID strategy); set monthly meeting schedule to routinely review leading ELA achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible

William Bickley (bicklew@martin.k12.fl.us)

Create and schedule "Walking Wednesdays."

Person Responsible

William Bickley (bicklew@martin.k12.fl.us)

#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.

While learning gains, and L25 learning gains improved, Math achievement dropped from 45% to 41% in SY22.

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

Grade 5 will increase Math achievement from 34% to 39% in SY23.
 Grade 6 will increase Math achievement from 18% to 23% in SY23.
 Grade 7 will increase Math achievement from 34% to 39% in SY23.
 Grade 8 will increase Math achievement from 55% to 60% in SY23.

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

Unit assessments; Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) Math

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Bickley (bicklew@martin.k12.fl.us)

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

Improve core instruction within our Math department through Collaborative Learning Team planning and data analysis, as well as "Walking Wednesday" teacher-led learning walks.

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

Collaborative Learning Teams empower teachers, promote collective teacher efficacy, and facilitate planning and reflection to improve teaching and learning.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Facilitate CLTs that focus on collaboration and student achievement.

Person Responsible

Jeff Raimann (raimanj@martinschools.org)

Create and schedule "Walking Wednesdays."

Person Responsible

Jeff Raimann (raimanj@martinschools.org)

Facilitate CLTs that focus on collaboration and student achievement.

Person Responsible

Jeff Raimann (raimanj@martinschools.org)

Create and schedule "Walking Wednesdays."

Person Responsible

Jeff Raimann (raimanj@martinschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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

Proficiency on our SSA (Grades 5 & 8 combined) dropped to 19% in SY22 from 23% in SY21 and 31% in SY19.

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

Proficiency for Grades 5 & 8 will increase from 19% to 31% in SY23 (Pre-Covid score).

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

Common summative assessments after each unit of study

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeff Raimann (raimanj@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

Improve core instruction within our Science department through Collaborative Learning Team planning and data analysis, as well as Learning Walks to observe instructional strategies

8th Grade - Utilize "Text Mapping" Literacy strategy to enhance comprehension of content
5th Grade - Incorporate key Science vocabulary terms during ELA block.

5th Grade - Increase the implementation of Science experiments (hands-on learning) within core instruction

5th Grade - Enrichment during Intervention will include:

implemented for this Area of Focus.	<p>**Additional opportunities for students to engage in Science application that embeds the The Scientific Method **Utilization of Science Readers to strengthen reading skills and increase exposure to science content</p>
	<p>Literacy Leadership Team to oversee monitoring and professional learning of school-wide literacy initiatives (active reading, writing to learn).</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Collaborative Learning Teams empower teachers, promote collective teacher efficacy, and facilitate planning and reflection to improve teaching and learning.</p>
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.	<p>Text Mapping is a reading comprehension technique where non-fiction text features are identified and their relevance to the content is recognized. It is a technique based on ancient scrolls for an experience with one long piece of text where the text becomes the organizer. Further, text mapping adds a visual element to the teacher's modeling and creates a concrete model for abstract ideas; teaches strategic reading and it creates a model for writing; encourages active reading and students can clearly see progress on the task by looking at marked pages; links comprehension concretely to the text: the text itself becomes the the map - bridges the gap between text and the graphic organizer - clearly focuses students on pre-reading strategies; produces a visual record of thinking; accommodates a wide range of learning styles; especially helpful for students with learning disabilities.</p>
Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	<p>Use of active reading strategies and writing across content-areas will increase metacognition, reflection on learning, and student agency.</p>

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.

Facilitate CLTs that focus on collaboration and student achievement.

Person Responsible Jeff Raimann (raimanj@martinschools.org)

Create and schedule "Walking Wednesdays."

Person Responsible Jeff Raimann (raimanj@martinschools.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

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

ELA achievement of students with disabilities is trending downward over a three-year period (SY19 - 16%, SY21 -9%, SY22 -8%).

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

As a subgroup, Students with Disabilities will increase ELA achievement from 8% to 13% in SY23, while increasing learning gains from 34% to 39%.

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

Benchmark Advanced (5)/Savvas (6-8) unit assessments; Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) ELA: Reading

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Inclusive and collaborative teaching methods using Universal Design for Learning and Differentiated Instructional approaches. Assistance for learning activities in the general education classroom through ESE support facilitation. Structured Literacy Programming through SPIRE instruction. Specific evidence-based practices including but not limited to: instructional matching, reciprocal teaching, incremental rehearsal, keyword mnemonics, mystery motivator, CRA (concrete, representational, abstract), and graphic organizers.

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

Strategies are chosen based on considered outcomes for the students. They are aligned with teacher characteristics, environment and student needs.

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.

PD sessions on Universal Design for Learning

Person Responsible	Katy Stoner (stonerk@martinschools.org)
---------------------------	-----------------------------------------

#5. 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.

ELA achievement of ELLs fell from 24% in SY21 to 17% in SY22; further, ELL LGs dropped two percentage points (SY21 - 37% - SY22 - 35%).

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

English language learners will increase ELA achievement from 17% to 22% in SY23, while increasing learning gains from 35% to 40%.

Monitoring:

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

Benchmark Advanced (5)/Savvas (6-8) unit assessments; Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) ELA: Reading

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Bickley (bicklew@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Teachers will be asked to consider the the following when developing lesson plans:

- background knowledge needed to understand the lesson
- opportunities to connect content to students' experience
- both content and language objectives
- key vocabulary and academic language needed for the lesson
- scaffolding and differentiated instruction opportunities
- peer learning

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

In content-area classes, ELLs face a double challenge: they must learn language and content at the same time. ELLs need the literacy, language skills, and background knowledge necessary to master that new content knowledge. Depending on their different stages of English proficiency and literacy, ELLs will benefit from the skills that a well-designed lesson can address. Further, peer learning can be a powerful tool in the classroom, particularly for English language learners.

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.

PD highlighting instructional planning with resources from Ellevation to bolster ELL achievement and learning gains.

**Person
Responsible**

William Bickley (bicklew@martin.k12.fl.us)

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

N/A

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

Grade 5 - Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practice to help students make sense of the text.

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)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

29% of students in Grade 5 will score at achievement level 3 or above on the May 2023 FAST: ELA - Reading.

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.

Benchmark Advanced (5)/Savvas (6-8) unit assessments; Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) ELA: Reading

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Bickley, William, bicklew@martin.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Grade 5 - Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practice to help students make sense of the text.

Part A: Build students' world and word knowledge so they can make sense of the text.

Part B: Consistently provide students with opportunities to ask and answer questions to better understand the text they read.

Part C: Teach students a routine for determining the gist of a short section of text.

Part D: Teach students to monitor their comprehension as they read.

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?

"By the time students are in upper-elementary grades, reading material in all subject areas conveys information and ideas that students are expected to learn and understand. When students are unable to understand these texts, they miss crucial opportunities to learn grade level content. The goal of this recommendation

is to provide teachers with ways to support students as they learn and practice routines and develop

reading habits that enable students to understand what they are reading" (WWC 2022007 - Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4–9 | Recommendation 3, Part A | 22).

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
Introduce Grade 5 teachers to research around the area of focus and rationale.	Bickley, William, bicklew@martin.k12.fl.us
Professional learning and literacy coaching to ensure fidelity of recommendations.	Bacchiochi, Jennifer , bacchij@martin.k12.fl.us
Schedule on-going training, coaching, and progress monitoring in conjunction with Just Read, Florida!	Bickley, William, bicklew@martin.k12.fl.us

Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

When it comes to building a positive school culture and environment with students, we leverage our PBIS Program to reward and recognize students that meet our SOAR expectations. Students receive Thunderbucks which in turn provides a wide array of rewards. In addition to the PBIS Program, we continue to utilize our Social Media pages to highlight positive happenings at our school site. In order to reach our students, we have now extended our digital presence over to Instagram. Additional methods of building a positive environment with our students, includes surveys obtaining and acting upon their feedback, along with continuing the tradition of recognition ceremonies (ex. honor roll).

When it comes to the staff, the PBIS Program also applies to our adults on campus, where they too can be

rewarded for great behaviors! In addition, we continue to highlight staff accomplishments on our Social Media pages, during staff meetings and the Principal's Bulletin. Surveys are sent out throughout the year and "Listening Sessions" are offered as another venue to obtain and act upon feedback.

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

This year we added a Team Leader Role, for Staff Engagement, aimed at enhancing a positive school culture and environment. Ashley Monks is this Team Leader. In addition, Principal Raimann takes the lead on the PR role via Social Media, Text Alerts, and the Principal's Bulletin. As of 9.21.22, we are seeking a new PBIS Team Leader, due to a resignation. Once this teammate is identified, we can add their name to the plan.