Martin County School District

Jensen Beach Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Jensen Beach Elementary School

2525 NE SAVANNAH RD, Jensen Beach, FL 34957

martinschools.org/o/jbe

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.

Jensen Beach Elementary strives to foster a nurturing and safe school community. We provide a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for success, allowing for individual differences and learning styles. We have a school-wide focus on urgency, importance, and teamwork. Parents, teachers, and community members are actively involved in our students' academic and character education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educate all students for success in a global society.

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
Radcliff, Jennifer	Principal	Evaluate data with the leadership team, and create a plan using research-based strategies. Monitor plan and adjust based on student data.
Law, Jamie	Assistant Principal	Evaluate data with the leadership team, and create a plan using research-based strategies. Monitor plan and adjust based on student data.
Foohs, Morgan	Instructional Coach	Evaluate data with the leadership team, and create a plan using research-based strategies. Monitor plan and adjust based on student data.
Baumgartner, Cherie	Instructional Media	Evaluate data with the leadership team and create a plan using research-based strategies as it pertains to STEM and Media. Monitor plan and adjust based on student data.
Joie, Jade	School Counselor	Evaluate data with the leadership team and create a plan using research-based strategies. Monitor plan and adjust based on student data.
Liberty, Lauren	Science Coach	Evaluate data with the leadership team and create a plan using research-based strategies. Monitor plan and adjust based on student data.

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.

We have a school administrative leadership team that collaborates with our content specific leadership teams. The content specific leadership teams are is devised of all teachers and staff members a since we all serve a role in supporting student success. These teams create the goals and strategies while the school administrative leadership team collaborates the teams to ensure all parts of the plan relate back to our school wide goals that that are essential to student success. In addition we have parents and community partners on our School Advisory Council who review the plan, provide feedback and come up with creative ideas to support the school in meeting the goals. We ensure our SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of
teachers, education support employees, students, parents, and other business and
community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic
community served by the school.

In addition this year for our eco-school initiative, we are including students and community members on our eco-action team to support learning in this area.

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))

Through monthly content area leadership team meetings, we will collaboratively review progress monitoring data and have conversations around instructional practice and student engagement.

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)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	24%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	45%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP)

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 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	17	14	15	17	15	18	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	1	4	1	1	4	2	0	0	0	13
Course failure in English Language Arts (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	3	8	14	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	6	10	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	7	14	21	18	9	0	0	0	76

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	1	1	2	6	4	4	0	0	0	18

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	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

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	34	22	31	28	27	31	0	0	0	173
One or more suspensions	90	2	4	5	11	15	0	0	0	127
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	11	13	9	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	9	10	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	7	4	6	7	13	0	0	0	44

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	4	0	3	10	17	13	0	0	0	47

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	34	22	31	28	27	31	0	0	0	173
One or more suspensions	90	2	4	5	11	15	0	0	0	127
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	11	13	9	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	9	10	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	7	4	6	7	13	0	0	0	44

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	4	0	3	10	17	13	0	0	0	47

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	65	55	53	74	53	56	68		
ELA Learning Gains				69			70		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			59		
Math Achievement*	78	62	59	77	43	50	68		
Math Learning Gains				73			45		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			42		
Science Achievement*	66	55	54	70	54	59	69		
Social Studies Achievement*					58	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		53	59					57	

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	274
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	475
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
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	47			
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	61			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	72			

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	52			

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	48			
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	60			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	61			

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	65			78			66					
SWD	37			50			48				4	
ELL	25			67							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			42							2	
HSP	57			66			50				4	
MUL	56			80							2	

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	69			81			71				4	
FRL	50			65			53				4	

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	74	69	53	77	73	59	70					
SWD	42	45	27	60	64	50	50					
ELL	54			50								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	54	58		64	73		50					
MUL	77			62								
PAC												
WHT	77	71	56	81	73	53	74					
FRL	66	63	46	68	65	59	61					

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	68	70	59	68	45	42	69					57
SWD	43	38		49	25		47					
ELL	50			33								57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	57			57								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	72	68	57	72	46	43	73					
FRL	61	63		54	26	46	53					55

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
05	2023 - Spring	68%	53%	15%	54%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	66%	7%	58%	15%
03	2023 - Spring	61%	51%	10%	50%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	76%	62%	14%	59%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	71%	14%	61%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	56%	17%	55%	18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	68%	50%	18%	51%	17%

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.

Based on the data from the 2023 FAST PM3, students with disabilities showed the lowest proficiency performance in reading. We will work on increasing student proficiency and learning gains for our students in this domain. The contributing factors were an increase in need for our learners with special needs to receive direct instruction in multi-sensory reading resulted in a decrease in support during other instructional times. With three state progress monitoring assessments, ELA unit tests, math topic tests, Fundations assessments and various other assessments administered at the grade level, support facilitators spent time an increased amount of time working with these students and completing them in smaller settings with accommodations.

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

Based on the data from the 2023 FAST PM3, third grade reading showed the greatest decline in proficiency by 14 points, from the prior year. One contributing factor was 35% of students who scored a level 1, were new students enrolled at JBE and/or Martin County Schools that year. Additionally, the number of students requiring intervention created barriers, such as the number of teachers able to deliver the intervention, due to the requirements of group size. Lastly, in third grade, seventeen students were absent ten percent or more during the school year.

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.

While above the state average in all data components, there is only a 4 point gap between JBE and the state
proficiency in Science. JBE did gain one point in Science proficiency, but when compared to other schools in the district JBE fell from first place to fourth overall. An increased focus on math instruction with the new standards and curriculum, additional math time scheduled into the school day, and an absence of usable space for hands-on science instruction may have contributed to gains not being as significant as desired.

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

Based on the data from the 2023 FAST PM3, fourth grade math showed the most improvement, with an increase in proficiency of seven points from the prior year. The contributing factors were intentional planning utilizing backwards design, weekly math CLT with a focus on differentiation and small group instruction.

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

Reflecting upon the EWS data, student attendance is a concern. School data reflects that students with poor attendance did not meet grade level proficiency across subject areas.

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

1. High levels of learning for all
2. Positive school culture
3. Systemic excellence

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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.

At Jensen Beach Elementary we have three school-wide goals which are systemic excellence, positive culture, and high levels of learning for all.
Teacher retention is a priority to maintain instructional rigor and positive school culture.
In 2022-2023, JBE hired three new instructional positions (10% of the instructional staff) and moved three instructional positions (10%). Moving into the 2023-2024 school year, JBE has hired six new instructional staff (19%) and moved five positions (16%). New hires account for new allocations and those individuals promoted to leadership positions, and retirements.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024, Jensen Beach Elementary will retain 95% of their instructional staff excluding retirements and re-locations.

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

Newly hired instructional staff will attend monthly Martin Mentors meetings. These meetings are scheduled and structured to provide strategic monthly support to our teachers. Attendance at these monthly meetings will be monitored by Jamie McNealy. Quarterly check in between new staff and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Radcliff (radclij@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.)

Intervention- Implementation of a teacher mentorship program throughout the 23-24 school year in collaboration
along with ensuring collaborative relationships with staff.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A teacher mentorship program can strengthen the culture of the school. Teachers see they have a chance to grow, right where they're at, and understand their leaders have their best interest in mind. We have a veteran staff who want to guide and support new teachers.

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.

Martin Mentors Training - attended by Jamie McNealy
Monthly Martin Mentors meetings. Attendance is required and monitored by Jamie McNealy.
Assigned grade level mentors.
New teachers will have regular grade level support throughout the school year.
Develop collaborative relationships between staff members.

Person Responsible: Jamie McNealy (mcnealj@martinschools.org)

By When: Beginning in August, the program will run throughout the year.

Regular instructional support during semi-weekly CLT meetings in collaboration with administration conducting quarterly check-ins with new hires from the past two school years to develop collaborative relationships with administration.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Radcliff (radclij@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Beginning in August, the program will run throughout the year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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.

Increasing student agency supports our school-wide goals of systemic excellence, positive culture, and high levels of learning for all, increasing student agency fits in all We want to provide a supportive and fulfilling environment with conditions that are conducive to learning and meet the needs of all students.

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

By the end of 2023-2024, the number of positive referrals for students will increase by 10% and the number of major office referrals will decrease by 10%. The number of out-of-school suspension will decrease from 49 to less than 25 days. Increase average daily attendance to 97%.

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

Disciplinary reports will be monitored monthly through FOCUS. Additional quantitative data such as participation in daily attendance, PBIS school-wide events, positive office referrals, office calls for support and suspension data will be reviewed. Individual student goals and progress will be discussed and monitored during grade level CLTs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Jamie Law (lawj@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.)

We will implement practices to increase student agency which will result in increases in academic achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Student agency, or the ability to manage one's learning, can have significant effects on academic achievement as students take an active role in seeking and internalizing new knowledge.
Students with a growth mindset are more likely to set academic goals focused on mastering content, rather than setting goals focused on achieving a particular test score or course grade.
Students who set mastery-oriented goals tend to process information in a deeper and more organized fashion than those who set performance-oriented goals.
The skills and behaviors associated with student agency are positively related to college and career outcomes because students are able to direct their own learning and transfer the knowledge they learned in the classroom to new setting.

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.

Admin will meet with grade levels quarterly to discuss behavioral/academic data, review school-wide expectations, and to set grade level quarterly goals through sports theme: Get in the GAME

Person Responsible: Jamie Law (lawj@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Implementation throughout the 23-24 school year

School Counselor will present lessons to classes focusing on character education and will conduct Tier 2 and Tier 3 skills groups.

Person Responsible: Jade Joie (joiej@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Implementation throughout the 23-24 school year

Implementation of a school-wide focus on becoming an Eco-School including highly engaging, hands-on lessons at each grade level.
Students to set regular goals, assess their own accountability, and to regularly track that they are making progress. Regular evidence will be provided by students to staff on their level of effort and engagement in daily lessons.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Radcliff (radclij@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Implementation throughout the 23-24 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.

With our school-wide goals of systemic excellence, positive culture, and high levels of learning for all, we are needing to increase student achievement of our students with disabilities. According to FAST Data in Grades 3-5, SWD with disabilities scored 37% proficiency in ELA and 51% proficiency in Math.

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

SWD proficiency will increase by 18% to reach 44% proficiency in ELA and 60% proficiency in Math.

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

Grade level CLTs will meet semi-weekly in order to monitor student data (FAST three times a year, Benchmark Unit Assessments, SAVVAS Topic Assessments and response to specialized instruction, etc.). CLTs is a process utilizing the continuous improvement model that focuses on standards-based instruction, common assessments, and prevention/intervention/extension of instruction as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jamie Law (lawj@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.)

Use of the continuous improvement process in CLT's where we focus on standards-based instruction, common assessments, and prevention/intervention/extension of instruction as needed will increase student achievement outcomes through intentional planning and instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborative planning using the cycle of continuous improvement holds staff accountable for all steps in the process towards student achievement
Plan: Identify an opportunity and plan for change.
Do: Implement the change on a small scale.
Check: Use data to analyze the results of the change and determine whether it made a difference.
Act: If the change was successful, implement it on a wider scale and continuously assess your results. If the change did not work, begin the cycle again.

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.

Grade level CLTs will meet to analyze individual student data to identify specific standards for teaching opportunities including pre-teaching and re-teaching, as needed.

Additionally grade level CLTs will meet collaboratively with our partner schools to discuss SWD and instructional strategies monthly.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Radcliff (radclij@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Implementation throughout the 23-24 school year

Continued professional development in research-based programs and research-based strategies to offer differentiated options for instruction for ESE students.

Person Responsible: Alice Lunt (lunta@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Implementation throughout the 23-24 school year

Professional development will be scheduled and documented in our professional development plan

Person Responsible: Jennifer Radcliff (radclij@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Implementation throughout the 23-24 school year

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

Students need additional opportunities to set personal learning goals, monitor and revise their goals and celebrate their growth and successes regarding benchmark-aligned targets. Teachers will be provided with additional resources and professional development to support student learning.

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

Ongoing progress monitoring and state assessment data collected from the 2022-2023 school year showed all student lower than our expectation of 80% proficiency in ELA (68%), Math (78%), and Science (68%).

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

Student progress will be monitored through common formative assessments and state progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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 our professional development plan that will be executed by all staff will support increased student achievement by using the action steps below to enhance instructional practices and provide access to increased opportunities for intervention and enrichment,

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With our school-wide goals of systemic excellence, positive culture, and high levels of learning for all, implementation of the professional development plan and the action steps below supports our goals.

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.

We have added the position of prevention intervention program specialist this year to strengthen processes and instructional practices. Our new prevention intervention program specialist is redesigning our MTSS process to ensure we have created a process that is aligned with our school-wide goal of systemic excellence. She will ensure effective implementation of intervention and enrichment groups. In addition she will ensure staff receives professional development on the use of Story Champs and Geodes in provide more diverse options in instructional tools to support student achievement. If we are able to

purchase a fourth grade Steps in Advance kit, we will use this to support our readers have not yet reached proficiency.

Person Responsible: Morgan Foohs (foohsm@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Implementation throughout the 23-24 school year

We have added the position of interventionist this year to increase opportunities for students in the lowest quartile. She will support high needs students at various grade levels. In addition, we are utilizing our related arts team to do interventions, vocabulary instruction and enrichment through the arts. We are also using paraprofessionals to support students that are on the cusp of proficiency as an additional layer of support.

Person Responsible: Morgan Foohs (foohsm@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Implementation throughout the 23-24 school year

This year we are working in partnership with Bessey Creek Elementary for CLT's monthly to collaborate on backwards instructional design and share best instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Radcliff (radclij@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Implementation throughout the 23-24 school year

A school-wide focus this year is the work required to become an eco-school in collaboration with the National Wildlife Foundation. Students will be participating in hands on lessons with real word applications. We are working with The GLOBE Program which has three primary goals: increasing environmental awareness, contributing to increased scientific understanding of the Earth and supporting improved student achievement in science and mathematics. Each grade level has a different scientific area of focus that are aligned with grade-level standards. Teachers will complete Globe professional development and implement the lessons and activities to support the eco-school work.

Person Responsible: Lauren Liberty (libertl@martinschools.org)

By When: Implementation throughout the 23-24 school year