

Martin County School District

# Murray Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

# Murray Middle School

4400 SE MURRAY ST, Stuart, FL 34997

[martinschools.org/o/mms](http://martinschools.org/o/mms)

## 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.**

Murray Middle School will educate all students for success.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Murray Middle School, through educating all students for success, will be an integral part of the dynamic system of excellence which is the Martin County School District.

## 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
Umbaugh, Jeffrey	Principal	Instruction, Operations, Climate & Culture.
Carbone, Kristin	Assistant Principal	Instruction, Operations, Climate & Culture.
Eimann, Emmie	Teacher, K-12	School Advisory Council, SIP Initiatives.
Sequeira, Christine	School Counselor	Staff Climate and Culture
Chasse, Paul	Teacher, K-12	SIP Initiatives for school climate and culture.
Caswell, Anita	Teacher, K-12	School initiatives for student climate and culture.
Barrett-Baxter, Ucola	Assistant Principal	Instruction, Operations, Climate & Culture.

**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.

Our School Leadership Team meets bi-weekly to analyze data and brainstorm solutions and strategies. The School Advisory Council meets monthly to review data and have discussions regarding school improvement.

**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))

Our School Leadership Team meets bi-weekly to review progress and monitor student achievement. There is additional individual monitoring which occurs for students with the greatest achievement gaps in our weekly MTSS Team meetings. Administrator walkthroughs will be regularly conducted to monitor the SIP strategies and ensure proper implementation. If strategies or approaches are deemed ineffective, the Leadership Team will adjust the plan as necessary.

**Demographic Data**  
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	55%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	70%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	60	55	73	188
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	31	29	113
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	14	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	17	33
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	51	58	187
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	42	52	183
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	1	9

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	58	39	53	150

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	2	12

**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	56	51	59	166
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4
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	75	51	55	181
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	40	51	175
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	51	55	181

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	64	41	45	150

**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	2	2	1	5

**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								56	51	59	166
One or more suspensions								1	1	2	4
Course failure in ELA								0	0	0	
Course failure in Math								0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment								75	51	55	181
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment								84	40	51	175
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.								75	51	55	181

**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	64	41	45	150

**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	2	2	1	5

**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*	43	51	49	43	53	50	43		
ELA Learning Gains				41			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			28		
Math Achievement*	44	57	56	48	32	36	45		
Math Learning Gains				48			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			34		
Science Achievement*	44	54	49	51	61	53	44		
Social Studies Achievement*	69	82	68	82	59	58	74		
Middle School Acceleration	52	75	73	46	48	49	49		
Graduation Rate					57	49			
College and Career Acceleration					85	70			
ELP Progress	41	47	40	59	65	76	58		

*\* 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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	293
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	502
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	17	Yes	4	2
ELL	25	Yes	4	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	29	Yes	3	1
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL	34	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	42			

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	29	Yes	3	1
ELL	37	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	2	
HSP	42			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	44			

**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	43			44			44	69	52			41
SWD	14			22			9	24			4	
ELL	15			19			8	41			5	41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22			25			20	50			4	
HSP	30			30			21	53	52		6	40
MUL	44			37					20		3	
PAC												
WHT	59			60			65	85	56		5	
FRL	35			34			36	64	43		6	41

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	43	41	34	48	48	50	51	82	46			59
SWD	14	27	19	25	38	31	33	55	18			
ELL	21	34	38	27	39	47	13	55				59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19	34	33	24	40	56	40	67	23			
HSP	31	36	33	36	39	40	33	68	43			59
MUL	62	50		48	53							
PAC												
WHT	56	44	33	61	55	67	60	90	49			
FRL	32	37	33	40	44	45	37	73	37			58

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	43	42	28	45	33	34	44	74	49			58
SWD	17	22	22	24	25	17	15	22				
ELL	15	22	22	25	36	52	4	40				58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	30	23	27	33	33	29	56	15			
HSP	29	33	28	32	29	39	28	58	39			57
MUL	52	44		60	50							
PAC												
WHT	56	50	29	55	34	26	54	86	54			
FRL	30	32	24	36	31	38	36	63	31			56

**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	51%	47%	4%	47%	4%
08	2023 - Spring	39%	48%	-9%	47%	-8%
06	2023 - Spring	35%	43%	-8%	47%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	36%	53%	-17%	54%	-18%
07	2023 - Spring	53%	58%	-5%	48%	5%
08	2023 - Spring	46%	44%	2%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	44%	51%	-7%	44%	0%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	55%	19%	50%	24%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	76%	-5%	66%	5%

### 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.**

6th graders were only 36% proficient in Math, representing a 14% decline compared to the previous year. Contributing factors include - it was an especially low-performing cohort upon arrival, and one of the two instructors left after only a few months, requiring us to place children into other classes and with instructors unfamiliar with 6th grade Math content.

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

The previously mentioned 14% decline by 6th graders in Math was the greatest decline. Again, contributing factors include - it was an especially low-performing cohort upon arrival, and one of the two instructors left after only a few months, requiring us to place children into other classes and with instructors unfamiliar with 6th grade Math content.

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

The 6th grade Math achievement number (36%) represents an 18% gap when compared to the state average (54%). As stated, contributing factors include - it was an especially low-performing cohort upon arrival, and one of the two instructors left after only a few months, requiring us to place children into other classes and with instructors unfamiliar with 6th grade Math content.

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

7th grade ELA showed the most improvement (+13% over the previous year, and a +7% result with that cohort of kids over the previous year). The two most significant actions: a new research-based ELA adoption and a significant increase in monitoring of CLT's accompanied with data discussions around the Level 2 students we were working to bump to proficiency.

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

Both attendance patterns and discipline referral numbers are concerning. These both directly affect student achievement.

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

- 1) Culture and Climate, specifically teacher retention
- 2) Instruction in ELA
- 3) Instruction in Math

**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.

ELA scores in proficiency and growth at MMS are below the district and state averages. With skills acquired in ELA contributing to growth and proficiency in other content areas, ELA achievement (proficiency and learning gains) are one of our areas of focus at Murray Middle School for 2023-2024.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

MMS will have at least 50% of students achieving proficiency by the third 2023-2024 FAST assessment. Low-performing subgroups (ESE, ELL, African American students) will each show a gain, lessening the gap from our total achievement average by at least 5%.

**Monitoring:**

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

The FAST assessment windows in August and December will be used to track student data, specifically which benchmarks and strands are in need of the most remediation. Data chats with teachers will focus on individual student proficiency by name. Teachers will use the CLT (PLC) process to monitor and reteach missed standards. Administration will monitor CLT participation and progress by attending meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jeffrey Umbaugh (umbaughj@martinschools.org)

**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.)

Across all subjects, teachers will increase the amount of student writing (graphical representation of their thinking) that is required. Writing is an important AVID focus as well as an example of student-centered learning espoused in a Gradual Release model. For our struggling subgroups (SLD, ELL, BLK), students will be aided with vocabulary banks and sentence starters as needed to better graphically represent their thinking.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Murray Middle School staff has begun the yearlong process of learning about "AVID" and preparing for schoolwide implementation next year (2024-2025). Following training at the AVID Summer Institute, the Leadership Team determined that focusing on writing was a good starting place, and would fit nicely with our press towards gradual-release of responsibility in our classrooms. Classroom walkthroughs and observations last school year indicated an over-reliance on teacher-guided work. If our teachers focus on gradual release which leads to increased student writing opportunities, student achievement will increase.

**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.

Monitoring of all CLT's, ensuring focus on the 4 essential questions of a CLT and opportunities for student writing within their lessons.

**Person Responsible:** Jeffrey Umbaugh (umbaughj@martinschools.org)

**By When:** Through school's conclusion.

Teachers are asked to display student work with feedback. Administrators will monitor when conducting classroom visits.

**Person Responsible:** Jeffrey Umbaugh (umbaughj@martinschools.org)

**By When:** Through school's conclusion.

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

### 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.

Our overall Math proficiency was at 52%, lower than the state and district averages. Focusing on our Math achievement is a logical step in our school's improvement.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Our overall Math proficiency will increase to 57% or higher on the 3rd FAST Assessment. Low-performing subgroups (ESE, ELL, African American students) will each show a gain, lessening the gap from our total achievement average by at least 5%.

### Monitoring:

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

The FAST assessment windows in August and December will be used to track student data, specifically which benchmarks and strands are in need of the most remediation. Data chats with teachers will focus on individual student proficiency by name. Teachers will use the CLT (PLC) process to monitor and reteach missed standards. Administration will monitor CLT participation and progress by attending meetings.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeffrey Umbaugh (umbaughj@martinschools.org)

### 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.)

Math teachers will increase the amount of student writing (graphical representation of their thinking) that is required through the use of notebooks, student tasks and assessments. Students will be given increased opportunities to explain their thinking when solving a problem. Our struggling subgroup students (SLD, ELL, BLK) will be aided with graphic organizers and interactive notebooks as needed to better graphically represent their thinking.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Due to the nature of math, with skills that build upon one another, it is imperative that we identify learning gaps and quickly remediate, so that the skills can continue to be acquired. By requiring students to explain their thinking in notes, tasks, and assessments, we can better target misconceptions and deficits.

### 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.

Monitoring of Math Pacing Calendar through administrator walkthroughs and CLT visits

**Person Responsible:** Jeffrey Umbaugh (umbaughj@martinschools.org)

**By When:** Through school's conclusion.

Monitoring of Math CLT's, ensuring focus on the 4 essential questions of a CLT and opportunities for students to explain their thinking within their notes, tasks, and assessments.

**Person Responsible:** Jeffrey Umbaugh (umbaugj@martinschools.org)

**By When:** Through the conclusion of school.

Math Teachers are asked to display student work with feedback. Administrators will monitor when conducting classroom visits.

**Person Responsible:** Jeffrey Umbaugh (umbaugj@martinschools.org)

**By When:** Through the conclusion of school.

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**

**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.

Data shows that MMS has a history of high teacher turnover (10+ per year the last three years). In order for school improvement initiatives to be most effective, a returning teaching staff is optimal so that professional development and collaborative conversations can be built on from year to year. Our area of focus: Teachers will choose to stay an employee of Murray Middle School due to our positive culture and environment.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

For the 2024-2025 school year, we will retain more of our teaching staff than was done for the previous three years, replacing fewer than 6 teachers from this year.

**Monitoring:**

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

We will use the 5Essentials data to develop short teacher climate surveys. These will be distributed quarterly, with the results discussed by the Leadership team to address any "culture killers" on campus. Clear communication will occur with the staff regarding why we're asking these questions, and what we're doing about the results.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Christine Sequeira (sequeic@martinschools.org)

**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.)

Our intervention will be improved communication, both teacher-to-administration and administration-to-teacher. In order to target a broad term like "Teacher Climate," my Leadership Team has to be able to focus on specific deficits as perceived by our teachers. Teacher surveys allow their voice to be heard and point us towards specific issues, and ensures the Leadership Team will be focusing in the right areas when problem-solving. The intervention of clear communication in both directions regarding the perceived issues and our action response.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When employees feel "heard" they feel valued. And employees who feel valued and supported are less likely to leave their employer.

**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.

5Essentials Teacher Survey results will be analyzed by the Leadership Team, and questions will be developed for a survey. The survey will be distributed quarterly. Results will be discussed and problem-solved as a team. The perceived deficits and resulting actions will be communicated with the staff.

**Person Responsible:** Christine Sequeira (sequeic@martinschools.org)

**By When:** First survey to be distributed in October.

### 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).

While no additional dollars are afforded us due to our ATSI status, we do follow a careful process to ensure allocations and resources are allocated based on needs. In February of 2023 the principal met with the Superintendent and district leaders to discuss teacher and support allocations which would be afforded to Murray Middle for the 2023-2024 school year. In the summer, a "Title One Needs Assessment" was used to develop the resulting Title One Budget for the 2023-2024 school year. This was submitted to and approved by the district's Title One supervisory personnel.

### 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.

In addition to linking to the SIP on our school webpage, this SIP and progress monitoring will be shared monthly at SAC meetings. MMS's School Improvements plan meetings held monthly are provided in-person and translated for Spanish-speaking attendees. Parent meetings are also opportunities where school staff focus on strategies to bolster SIP goals and areas of focus.

**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))

MMS 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 through the activities outlined in our Family Engagement Plan.

**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)**

MMS plans to strengthen the academic program, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum by offering after school activities including clubs related to STEM, history, reading, and other high-interest focuses. Supplies and programming will allow for an enriched and accelerated curriculum.

**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))**

Murray Middle School's plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as: Title I Part A, Title III/ ELL, and Title 9/ Homeless Families in Transition.