

Martin County School District

Dr. David L. Anderson Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Dr. David L. Anderson Middle School

7000 SE ATLANTIC RIDGE DR, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/ddlam

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Martin County School Board on 9/19/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Allen, Vonetta	School Counselor	Team Leader-School Culture and PBIS
Covington, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader-School Culture and PBIS
Belvin, Tonya	Teacher, K-12	Math Data Team Leader
Bickley, William	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal-Curriculum
Destefanis, Richard	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal-Student Services
Falzon, Anthony	Dean	Assist with PBIS implementation and monitoring (School Culture Goal)
Iuillucci, Theresa	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal-Student Services
Jarrett, Ebony	Principal	
Jones, Kalie	Staffing Specialist	ESE Department student goals
Smith, Rachel	Instructional Coach	AVID School Coordinator
Johnson, Juanita	Instructional Coach	New teacher coaching and support

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Data was shared and discussed with the School's Leadership Team. Their major areas of concern was used in the development of our plan. Due to the early submission deadline, we have not been able to coordinate our School Advisory Council. They will be a part of the monitoring of our plan as the year progresses.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Dr. Anderson Middle School will analyze data and reflect in content area collaborative learning teams. This will be done as soon as data is released from previous year's testing and FAST progress monitoring. CLTs will use the ATLAS looking at Data protocol and complete google forms. Professional development will be created based on data and teacher's input from the google form.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	64%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	64%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: C

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	74	79	236
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	67	48	159
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	3	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	141	128	419
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	131	82	319
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	381	410	294	1085

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	21	16	59

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	48	46	145
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	9	35
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	91	93	297
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	87	75	309
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	48	46	145
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	9	35
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	91	93	297
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	87	75	309
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	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	22

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	40	51	49	42	53	50	46		
ELA Learning Gains				43			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31			42		
Math Achievement*	45	57	56	51	32	36	52		
Math Learning Gains				60			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			42		
Science Achievement*	46	54	49	48	61	53	58		
Social Studies Achievement*	75	82	68	74	59	58	77		
Middle School Acceleration	72	75	73	67	48	49	67		
Graduation Rate					57	49			
College and Career Acceleration					85	70			
ELP Progress	59	47	40	46	65	76	43		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	337
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	512
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	20	Yes	2	2
ELL	35	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	94			
BLK	44			
HSP	47			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	69			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	48			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	1	1
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	44			
HSP	45			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	46			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	40			45			46	75	72			59
SWD	14			18			9	37			4	
ELL	16			24			15	45	53		6	59
AMI												
ASN	94			94							2	
BLK	20			24			37	74	67		5	
HSP	30			33			31	62	67		6	61
MUL	43			54			43	86	67		5	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	55			63			63	87	75		5	
FRL	30			35			32	65	65		6	61

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	42	43	31	51	60	50	48	74	67			46
SWD	14	30	21	21	44	46	20	52	30			
ELL	19	32	26	28	46	44	26	61	45			46
AMI												
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			45
MUL	44	42		64	67		40	60	67			
PAC												
WHT	54	51	39	66	68	62	64	82	76			
FRL	31	36	29	42	55	46	39	72	57			50

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	46	49	42	52	43	42	58	77	67			43
SWD	20	33	35	31	37	33	38	52	46			
ELL	27	37	32	32	38	42	24	55	44			43
AMI												
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			43
MUL	46	53	58	35	33	40	64	67	67			
PAC												
WHT	58	55	48	64	47	52	72	87	71			
FRL	37	43	40	41	38	41	51	67	58			43

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	37%	47%	-10%	47%	-10%
08	2023 - Spring	40%	48%	-8%	47%	-7%
06	2023 - Spring	35%	43%	-8%	47%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	48%	53%	-5%	54%	-6%
07	2023 - Spring	40%	58%	-18%	48%	-8%
08	2023 - Spring	29%	44%	-15%	55%	-26%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	46%	51%	-5%	44%	2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	55%	23%	50%	28%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	51%	44%	48%	47%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	76%	-3%	66%	7%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

ELA Achievement for our school was 42%. This was a 4% decrease from the previous year.
 ELA Learning Gains 43%: -6% (2021); -10% (2019)
 ELA Lowest Quartile 31%: -11% (2021); -17% (2019)

In the 2022-2023 school year 65% of 6th graders, 63% of 7th graders, and 60% of 8th graders scored below grade-level on the PM3 administration of FAST: ELA.

Contributing factors may include our expanding demographic of English learners, residual impact of Covid 19, substitutes covering classes due to teacher shortages, not having ELL paraprofessionals to push in and support classes, and not having professional development for teachers on ELL strategies.

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

ELA L25 Learning Gains decreased by 11% from the prior year.

Contributing factors may include our expanding demographic of English learners, residual impact of Covid 19, substitutes covering classes due to teacher shortages, not having ELL paraprofessionals to push in and support classes, and not having professional development for teachers on ELL strategies.

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

Grade 6 ELA (-12% compared to State)

AMS ELA 35% proficient; State of Florida 46%

Contributing factors may include our expanding demographic of English learners, residual impact of Covid 19, substitutes covering classes due to teacher shortages, not having ELL paraprofessionals to push in and support classes, and not having professional development for teachers on ELL strategies.

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

Comparable assessments (Civics and Science were -3 & -2, respectively).

Collaborative team planning.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Areas of concern from the EWS data would be the large number of students that scored a Level 1 on the ELA assessment (419) and the number of students that had 10% or more absences for the year (236).

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

Create and cultivate a culture conducive to learning and growing (students and staff).

Improve ELA outcomes for ALL students, while closing the achievement gap for identified subgroups (ELL, SWD).

Improve achievement and learning gains for Students with Disabilities.

Improve achievement and learning gains for English Learners.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In the 2022-2023 school year 65% of 6th graders, 63% of 7th graders, and 60% of 8th graders scored below grade-level on the PM3 administration of FAST: ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

43% of Anderson Middle School students in Grades 6 - 8 will score On- Grade Level or greater as evidenced by a Level 3 on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) ELA PM3 administration.

Monitoring:

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

Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) ELA PM1 (August) will be used as a baseline, while the PM2 administration (December) will be used to monitor growth toward our outcome goal. The FAST PM3 administration will ultimately monitor for the desired outcome. Other progress monitoring includes common formative assessments throughout the school year, walk through data, and quarterly, IEP progress reports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Provide direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers should provide students with direct and explicit instruction in comprehension strategies to improve students' reading comprehension. These strategies include summarizing, asking and answering questions, paraphrasing, and finding the central idea. Direct and explicit teaching involves a teacher modeling and providing explanations of the specific strategies students are learning, giving guided practice and feedback on the use of the strategies, and promoting independent practice to apply the strategies. As the lesson begins, it is important for teachers to tell students specifically what strategies they are going to learn, tell them why it is important for them to learn the strategies, model how to use the strategies by thinking aloud with a text, provide guided practice with feedback so that students have opportunities to practice using the strategies, provide independent practice using the strategies, and discuss with students when and where they should apply the strategies.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Professional learning covering direct and explicit instruction of comprehension strategies will assist all teachers, including language arts and content-area teachers, in learning how to teach strategies. One component of professional development should be coaching teachers in the classroom as they teach.

Person Responsible: Juanita Johnson (johnsoj2@martinschools.org)

By When: 10/31/23

Intentional planning around instruction of reading comprehension strategies in whole and small-group during Collaborative Learning Teams.

Person Responsible: Juanita Johnson (johnsoj2@martinschools.org)

By When: 10/31/23

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A positive school culture is the foundation for creating a school environment where teaching and learning can occur.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will see a 25% reduction in discipline referrals from the 22-23 school year. This past year, we had 1,818 total referrals. We would like to reduce this number to no more than 1,368.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this through our data analysis of discipline data, climate survey data from all stakeholders, weekly MTSS meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Theresa Iulucci (iuliuict@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

PBIS is an evidence based, tiered framework for supporting behavioral, academic, and social growth with students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When implemented with fidelity, the PBIS system impacts academic success of students and improves school culture for teachers and students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Professional Development for teachers on our PBIS system.

Person Responsible: Heather Covington (covingtonh@martinschools.org)

By When: Pre-planning week (August 2023)

Ongoing PBIS meetings and teacher trainings.

Person Responsible: Vonetta Allen (allenv@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the school year

We will create opportunities to motivate students and acknowledge them for meeting our PBIS expectations. They will be rewarded with Stallion Dollars, which are physical cards, that can be used to

purchase prizes in the PBIS Store, earn attendance at special events, earn entries into after school athletic events, and entries for special drawings and prizes.

Person Responsible: Vonetta Allen (allenv@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

#3. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ESSA Subgroup two consecutive years below 41%

4% of 6th grade students with disabilities were on or above grade-level, while just 12% of 7th, and 34% of 8th grade SWDs were on or above grade-level on the PM3 FAST ELA administration.

SWDs scored 20 percentage points below the school average for students 6-8 scoring on level or greater.

Measurable Outcome:

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

41% of SWD at Anderson Middle School students in Grades 6 - 8 will score On- Grade Level or greater as evidenced by a Level 3 on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) ELA PM3 administration.

Monitoring:

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

Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) ELA PM1 (August) will be used as a baseline, while the PM2 administration (December) will be used to monitor growth toward our outcome goal. The FAST PM3 administration will ultimately monitor for the desired outcome. Common formative assessments throughout the school year will be analyzed in collaborative learning team meetings. Other progress monitoring includes common formative assessments throughout the school year, walk through data, and quarterly, IEP progress reports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Implementation of the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles, including Representation, Actions & Expression, and Engagement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

UDL reduces barriers in instruction, provides appropriate accommodations, supports, and challenges, and maintains high achievement expectations for all students. UDL provides flexibility in the ways information is presented, how students are engaged in and respond to instruction to demonstrate learning. It includes concepts such as scaffolding, peer learning, and modeling.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

ESE team will provide initial professional learning to AMS teachers within CLTs.

Person Responsible: Kalie Jones (jonesk@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: 10/31/23

AMS teachers will include UDL Principles within lesson plans and implement within instruction.

Person Responsible: Kalie Jones (jonesk@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: 11/17/23

#4. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ESSA Subgroup two consecutive years below 41%

Measurable Outcome:

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

41% of ELL students at Anderson Middle School students in Grades 6 - 8 will score On- Grade Level or greater as evidenced by a Level 3 on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) ELA PM3 administration.

Monitoring:

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

Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) ELA PM1 (August) will be used as a baseline, while the PM2 administration (December) will be used to monitor growth toward our outcome goal. The FAST PM3 administration will ultimately monitor for the desired outcome. Other progress monitoring includes common formative assessments throughout the school year, walk through data, and quarterly, IEP progress reports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Provide designated time to develop English oral language proficiency. Provide sheltered instruction practices (i.e., comprehensible input and language objectives) to support students in content-area learning. Teach explicit comprehension strategies to assist students in accessing content while they are developing English proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

ELs need time to develop their oral proficiency in English, which is often overlooked in the instructional programming for ELs (August & Shanahan, 2006). There is a strong link between oral language proficiency and text-level skills such as comprehension (Lesaux & Geva, 2006).

Examples of sheltered instructional techniques include having clear content and language objectives, building background knowledge, providing information in a comprehensible way, teaching learning strategies, and providing students with opportunities to interact with peers and teachers (see Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2012). Examples of sheltered instructional techniques include having clear content and language objectives, building background knowledge, providing information in a comprehensible way, teaching learning strategies, and providing students with opportunities to interact with peers and teachers (see Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2012). ELs must be explicitly taught comprehension strategies to help them access the content while they are developing English proficiency. Strategies include summarizing, inferring, making connections, and asking questions. Structured peer discussion and collaborative activities are included throughout the before-during-after reading process; together, students use reading strategies to monitor their comprehension, review and synthesize information, ask and answer questions, and take steps to improve their understanding.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Leverage teacher allocation to provide designated time for identified ELLs (DEUSS two years or less/ ACCESS for ELLs 2.9 Composite or less) to develop oral language proficiency.

Person Responsible: William Bickley (bicklew@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: 8/10/23

In addition to utilizing Imagine Learning (60 minutes per week), a framework for our ELL Support Class will be established utilizing sheltered instructional techniques, structured peer discussion and collaborative peer reading activities.

Person Responsible: William Bickley (bicklew@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: 8/10/23

Professional learning in utilizing embedded approaches to building vocabulary (high-utility academic words, word-learning strategies) across content areas.

Person Responsible: Charles Santos (santosc@martinschools.org)

By When: 10/31/23

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

To best meet the needs of our students, we allocated Title 1 funds to hire staff members who will provide support to our students and parents. These positions include a fulltime Prevention Intervention Specialist who will lead the MTSS process, an Intervention Teacher who will support curriculum and instruction, Title 1 Support Staff Member who works with our ELL paras and content area teachers, and a Parent Liaison who is our home and school connection. All of their roles are clearly defined and regular meetings are held to discuss the impact on student achievement.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP's implementation and progress monitoring will be shared at our School Advisory Council Meetings. They will also be shared at Parent Engagement Night events such as Curriculum Night. All of our communication is in English and Spanish to engage all stakeholders.

<https://www.martinschools.org/o/ddlam>

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We will build positive relationships by improving our communication with families and organizing parent engagement nights. We will present information that is important to families in how they can support their child's educational journey. We regularly update our website and school's Facebook page. Information is sent out in both English and Spanish.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Our academic program is most critical as this is the only way to increase student achievement. Instructional time is protected. Special bell schedules have been created to ensure that students do not miss class time when events such as early release and testing take place. We have instructional coaches who support curriculum and instruction with a targeted focus on our new teachers. We have mandatory new teacher meetings on campus and District Martin Mentor trainings as well. Each new teacher has been assigned a mentor who will support them throughout the school year. Professional Development is designed base on individual needs of the teacher, department, or school.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A