Martin County School District

Stuart Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Stuart Middle School

575 SE GEORGIA AVE, Stuart, FL 34994

martinschools.org/o/sms

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.

The mission of the Martin County School District, in partnership with family and community, is to Educate All Students for Success. Stuart Middle School is committed to providing a safe and challenging learning environment which will empower all students to achieve their utmost potential. The Stuart Middle School team, along with the shared involvement of students, parents, and community provides environment that inspires, engages, and challenges all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Stuart Middle School envisions that all students will be prepared for the rigorous demands of high school.

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
Jones, Christopher	Principal	Facilitate the implementation of the school-wide instructional program as indicated within the School Improvement Plan. This includes monitoring instructional practices and student outcomes; providing guidance, direction, and feedback to students, staff, and families; and taking action to addressareas of weakness evidenced within our performance data.
Desreuisseau, Lori	Assistant Principal	The role of the Assistant Principal-Curriculum and Assessment is to support the mission and vision outlined in the School Improvement Plan. My support will include monitoring instructional practices and student outcomes; providing guidance, direction, and feedback to all stakeholders; and leading professional learning. Student data will be the focus of all problem solving and action planning conversations.
Moody, Charlie	Assistant Principal	The role of the Assistant Principal-Student Services is to support the mission and vision outlined in the School Improvement Plan. My support will include monitoring student safety and engagement in learning; providing guidance, direction, and feedback to all stakeholders; and ensuring a learning environment that supports effective learning for all. Student data will be the focus of all problem solving and action planning conversations

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.

Monica Pool-School Improvement Team Leader
Erica Wozny-School Culture Team Leader
Ashley Byrd-AVID Coordinator
Jordan Claus-PBiS Team Leader
Tracy White-ELA Team Leader
Simone Flood-Science Team Leader
Nicholas Berkley- Social Studies Team Leader
Duane Turner-Math Team Leader

School level team leaders reviewed the first submission of the SIP analyzing data and developing the action steps to address the subgroup data. The action steps will be implemented in the PLC process and documented with artifacts. The second review of the SIP will be done at the first SAC meeting on September 6, 2023 with all stakeholders.

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))

The SIP is a living document that is used to drive professional development, coaching of teachers, analysis of data and culture initiatives of the school. Administration and Team Leaders will reflect on the SIP on a regular basis to set the initiatives throughout the school year. Data analysis will be at the forefront to make necessary changes for all students to succeed. All staff will be involved in the Data Analysis process to know and understand the initiatives and the needs presented as new data comes to the table.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	39%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	50%
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 *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 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	101	55	74	230
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	34	39	122
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	34	37	81
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	8	23	50
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	59	51	157
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	72	65	179
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	58	67	170
	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	5	14	29	48

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	1	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4

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	102	89	104	295
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	35	35	106
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	31	49	87
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	27	28	64
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	72	66	194
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	70	60	203
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	69	91	85	245

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	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	4

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	102	89	104	295
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	35	35	106
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	31	49	87
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	27	28	64
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	72	66	194
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	70	60	203
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	58	67	170

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	69	91	85	245

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	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	4

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*	51	51	49	54	53	50	55		
ELA Learning Gains				47			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32			39		
Math Achievement*	57	57	56	58	32	36	55		
Math Learning Gains				55			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			33		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	50	54	49	56	61	53	48		
Social Studies Achievement*	79	82	68	88	59	58	78		
Middle School Acceleration	74	75	73	68	48	49	67		
Graduation Rate					57	49			
College and Career Acceleration					85	70			
ELP Progress	20	47	40	17	65	76	54		

* 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	331
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	520
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	24	Yes	4	1
ELL	26	Yes	3	1
AMI				
ASN	66			
BLK	33	Yes	2	
HSP	46			
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	43			

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	32	Yes	3	
ELL	36	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	65			
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	45			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	60			
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	51			57			50	79	74			20
SWD	22			25			19	31			4	
ELL	19			22			17	53			5	20
AMI												
ASN	63			69							2	
BLK	23			24			18	67			4	
HSP	33			45			36	74	68		6	19
MUL	50			53			50				3	
PAC												
WHT	61			66			61	82	75		5	
FRL	35			42			33	69	60		6	21

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	54	47	32	58	55	45	56	88	68			17
SWD	27	35	30	31	40	31	16	59	20			
ELL	24	29	30	41	48	33	25	75				17
AMI												
ASN	60	59		80	59							
BLK	22	34	38	24	34	31	19	73				
HSP	42	40	35	44	48	39	41	88	50			18
MUL	43	50		41	55	90		73				
PAC												
WHT	62	50	27	66	59	48	64	90	70			
FRL	39	39	31	42	49	43	38	82	53			21

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	55	51	39	55	46	33	48	78	67			54
SWD	24	38	33	22	29	31	8	46				
ELL	33	48	54	36	44	38	19	64				54

					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
AMI												
ASN	65	43		59	43							
BLK	28	39	33	17	22	19	19	55				
HSP	51	53	55	46	45	36	38	74	55			52
MUL	45	42		35	30							
PAC												
WHT	61	53	38	64	51	38	55	82	72			
FRL	43	42	36	37	36	31	36	71	44			53

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	49%	47%	2%	47%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	47%	48%	-1%	47%	0%
06	2023 - Spring	48%	43%	5%	47%	1%

				MATH		
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	57%	53%	4%	54%	3%
07	2023 - Spring	64%	58%	6%	48%	16%
08	2023 - Spring	29%	44%	-15%	55%	-26%

				SCIENCE		
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	50%	51%	-1%	44%	6%

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	100%	51%	49%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	76%	2%	66%	12%

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.

Students in our African American subgroup showed the lowest performance in ELA proficiency (21%) and math (22%). Students With Disabilities (29% ELA/24% Math) and English Language Learners (26% ELA/ 24% Math) also demonstrated a gap in performance when compared to the proficiency rates for the whole group (48% ELA/ 55% math). We believe that student performance impacted by limited teacher monitoring and intentional interventions to ensure the progress of students by subgroup. See below for more specific data by subgroup and cohort.

6th grade ELA AA: 19% proficient
6th grade M AA: 26% proficient
6th grade HISP: ELA 31%
6th grade M HISP: 47%
6th grade ELL: 23%
6th grade M ELL: 28%
6th grade SWD: 26%
6th grade M SWD: 16%

7th grade ELA AA: 18% proficient
7th grade Math AA: 22% proficient
7th grade EL A HISP: 31%
7th grade Math HISP: 45%
7th grade ELA ELL: 12%
7th grade Math ELL: 23%

7th grade ELA SWD: 11%
7th grade Math SWD: 39%

8th grade ELA AA: 27% proficient
8th grade On Level Math AA: 12% proficient
8th grade ELA HISP: 33%
8th grade On Level Math HISP: 30%
8th grade ELA ELL: 4%
8th grade On Level Math ELL: 18%
8th grade ELA SWD: 21%
8th grade On Level Math SWD: 15%

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

The greatest decline occurred in 8th grade Civics. The overall proficiency score dropped from 89% in 2022 to 78% in 2023. Teachers report that they believe student behavior and reading ability to be contributing factors.

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 data component that has the greatest gap when compared to the state average is 8th Grade Math. In 2023 29% of on-level 8th graders demonstrated proficiency compared to the district average of 44% and the state average of 55%.

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

The areas where the most improvement was shown were algebra and geometry whose students grew 79% and 90% from PMT 1 to PMT 3 respectively.

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

Our most significant concern is attendance. According to our EWS data we had over 230 students with 10% or more absences. Middle School is a critical time in students academics and chronic absences negatively impact students ability to learn. We will continue to progress monitor students attendance and if it becomes a chronic issue recommend the students to the MTSS process.

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

1. Increase ELA Proficiency by 5% (48%- 53%) overall and by 7% among the subgroups identified above to decrease the achievement gaps present.
Increase FAST Math Proficiency by 6% (50%- 55%) overall and by 7% among the subgroups identified above to decrease the achievement gaps present..
2. Mentor and retain teachers with a focus on training and support in data analysis and data informed teaching through PLC.
3. Implement research based instructional strategies (including AVID, Gradual Release, small group reteaching) through professional learning and lesson study.

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.

Stuart Middle School hired eighteen new staff members across content areas and appointed a new Principal this past summer. Nearly 50% of the ELA department is comprised of new or new to SMS teachers. As a result of the number of new staff members it will be critical to ensure that the SMS community develops and commits to a singular culture of instructional excellence that is supported by common (research-based) teaching practices and a climate that supports student safety and risk taking in their learning.

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

95% of all teachers and staff will return to SMS for the 2024-2025 school year. PMT data will show consistent instructional growth in ELA and Math. Student discipline referrals will be reduced by 25% from 2023, and classroom walkthrough data will show consistent use of effectively implemented instructional practices more than 75% of the time.

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

Stuart Middle School does weekly learning walks for all teachers providing feedback and coaching opportunities. Administration and Martin Mentors will review this data monthly to determine professional development needs and coaching needs for teachers. Martin Mentors will be paired with New Teachers and PEC teachers to provide them bi-monthly professional development and coaching. Martin Mentors will share in the monthly meeting their coaching log and any support new teachers may need. All teachers will be provided support to be successful and assist their students in making growth and gains academically and socially.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Pool (poolm@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.)

ATLAS Looking at Data (School Reform Initiative Protocol)
Professional learning for all teachers related to AVID strategies. (AVID School Wide Planning Year)
Professional Development in the effective implementation of PLC strategies (R. DuFour, 2006)
Student exemplars shared through public display (Visible Learning, 2008. J. Hattie)
Lesson Study (Visible Learning, 2008. J. Hattie)

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

PLC strategies have been proven effective in developing collective efficacy among teachers (DuFour, Hattie)

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.

Teachers are provided with professional development in AVID strategies and the PLC process. The effectiveness of the professional development will be observed in learning walks, action research, lesson studies and other PLC artifacts.

Person Responsible: Monica Pool (poolm@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 2023

New SMS teachers will be provided professional development in CHAMPs and mentored/coached by their Martin Mentor and Administration. The effectiveness of the professional development and coaching will be observed in learning walks.

Person Responsible: Monica Pool (poolm@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: January 2024

#2. 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 proficiency has declined consistently over time and students in our AA, ELL, and SWD subgroups continue to perform less well than their peers. Data from learning walks in 2022-23 revealed that inconsistent instructional practices were occurring across ELA classrooms including a deficiency in small group remediation. This information suggests a need for improved and more consistent instructional practices across grade-levels and classrooms. To further support the need for prioritization of academic focus in ELA, several new teachers joined the SMS team this year bringing with them varied levels of experience.

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

At least 55% of students will demonstrate proficiency overall (increase of 5%) and subgroup data will show a 7% increase from 2023 on ELA FAST in Spring 2024

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

Student performance will be monitored through formative assessment data collected weekly by teachers; by Unit Assessment data collected monthly; and by PMT data collected in Q1 and Q2. Teachers will use the data collected to plan and provide focused instruction that is developed through the bi-weekly PLC process to address concepts where proficiency was not achieved by specific students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tracy White (whitet@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 AVID WICOR Strategies to increase engagement and concept attainment.
Consistent use of core ELA curricular materials will be used to ensure continuity of instruction across classes.
Teacher use of ATLAS Looking at Data tool to support their understanding of data trends (School Reform Initiative Protocol)
Implementation of the Lexia Power Up Reading Intervention in Tier 3 Reading Courses
Implementation of the Structured Literacy Approach in Tier 2 & Tier 3 Reading Courses

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

These evidence based strategies are selected from What Works Clearinghouse and research in the educational field.

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.

Content team leader for ELA will lead the PLCs in analyzing data, implementing action research, and assisting with the PLC process.

Person Responsible: Tracy White (whitet@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 2023

#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.

Only one-third of students with disabilities were able to demonstrate proficiency in ELA, and only one-fourth of students with an identified disability were able to demonstrate proficiency in math on the 2023 FAST Assessments.

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

At least 31% of students with disabilities will be proficient on the Math FAST Spring of 2024. (Increase of 7%)

At least 36% of students with disabilities will be proficient on the ELA FAST in Spring of 2024.(Increase of 7%)

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

Student performance will be monitored through formative assessment data collected weekly by teachers; by Unit Assessment data collected monthly; and by PMT data collected in Q1 and Q2. Teachers will use the data collected to plan and provide focused instruction that is developed through the bi-weekly PLC process to address concepts where proficiency was not achieved by specific students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Valerie Mariano (marianv@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.)

Lexia Power Up Reading Intervention will be used to support students in Tier 3 Reading Courses
SPIRE and Sound Sensible Intervention will be used to support students in Tier 3 ESE Reading Courses
Structured Literacy Approach will be implemented in Tier 2 & Tier 3 Reading Courses
Snap & Read Adaptive Technology will be used as needed to support learning.

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

These evidence based strategies are selected from What Works Clearinghouse and research in the educational field. (https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/)

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 Specialists and teachers will analyze the data from the Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading interventions to determine if it is closing students achievement gaps.

Person Responsible: Valerie Mariano (marianv@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: January 2024

All PLCs will analyze data as part of the PLC process and make instructional changes to meet the needs of the students. Administration and team leaders will monitor the PLC artifacts and data.

Person Responsible: Lori Desreuisseau (desreul@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: April 2024

#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.

Only one-fourth of English Language Learners were able to demonstrate proficiency in ELA and math on the 2023 FAST Assessments. SMS team members believe that this deficit is a result of a need for increased support in English Language acquisition.

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

At least 33% of ELLs will be proficient on the Math FAST Spring of 2024. (Increase of 7%)
At least 31% of ELLs will be proficient on the ELA FAST in Spring of 2024.(Increase of 7%)

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

Student performance will be monitored through formative assessment data collected weekly by teachers; by Unit Assessment data collected monthly; and by PMT data collected in Q1 and Q2. Teachers will use the data collected to plan and provide focused instruction that is developed through the bi-weekly PLC process to address concepts where proficiency was not achieved by specific students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lori Desreuisseau (desreul@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.)

Snap & Read Adaptive Technology will be used to scaffold acquisition of English language concepts and apply them to the content in classes.
Imagine Learning Instructional Software will be used to develop fluency in English.
Engagement strategies and small group instruction to address skill deficits will be planned for and implemented intentionally.

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

These evidence based strategies are selected from What Works Clearinghouse and research in the educational field. (https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/)

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.

The assistant principal and teachers will monitor imagine learning data to determine if it is closing the gap for students. Instructional changes will be made based on the data.

Person Responsible: Lori Desreuisseau (desreul@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: January 2024

All PLCs will analyze data as part of the PLC process and make instructional changes to meet the needs of the students. Administration and team leaders will monitor the PLC artifacts and data.

Person Responsible: Monica Pool (poolm@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: April 2024

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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 among students in our African American subgroup have shown the least consistent academic success. A substantial gap exists between the performance of these students and others students within the whole group. A need for improved practices among teachers in the careful monitoring and remediation of specific skills for students has been observed. A need for improved implementation of research -based tools and practices has also been observed.

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

At least 28% of African American students will be proficient on the Math FAST Spring of 2024. (Increased by 7%)
At least 29% of African American students will be proficient on the ELA FAST in Spring of 2024.(Increased by 7%)

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

Student performance will be monitored through formative assessment data collected weekly by teachers; by Unit Assessment data collected monthly; and by PMT data collected in Q1 and Q2. Teachers will use the data collected to plan and provide focused instruction that is developed through the bi-weekly PLC process to address concepts where proficiency was not achieved for specific students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Jones (jonesc@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 AVID WICOR Strategies to increase engagement and concept attainment.
Teacher use of ATLAS Looking at Data tool to support their understanding of data trends (School Reform Initiative Protocol)
Implementation of the Lexia Power Up Reading Intervention in Tier 3 Reading Courses
Implementation of the Structured Literacy Approach in Tier 2 & Tier 3 Reading Courses

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

These evidence based strategies are selected from What Works Clearinghouse and research in the educational field. (https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/)

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.

Principal and teachers will analyze the data from tier 2 and tier 3 reading interventions to monitor if the achievement gap is being closed. The Principal and teachers will make instructional changes based on the data.

Person Responsible: Christopher Jones (jonesc@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: January 2024

All PLCs will analyze data as part of the PLC process and make instructional changes to meet the needs of the students. Administration and team leaders will monitor the PLC artifacts and data.

Person Responsible: Christopher Jones (jonesc@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: April 2024

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).

Teachers/PLC teams request instructional materials to support school-wide learning that ensures successful achievement of SIP goals. The request is presented to the principal for initial approval then referred to the SAC for consideration. The teacher/team making the request is then expected to attend the SAC meeting to present the request to the SAC committee. The SAC committee may ask additional questions. The next step would be a motion to approve the SAC request. If a motion to approve the SAC request is made it can be approved or denied based on the vote of the committee.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment				$7,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	1000E	4330	0021 - Stuart Middle School	General Fund		$5,000.00
			Notes: PLC team facilitators will attend a professional learning conference (Solution Tree) to develop their understanding of the teaching and learning cycle following the teachings of R. Dufour, A. Muhammad, and others.			
	1000E	4510	0021 - Stuart Middle School	General Fund		$2,000.00
			Notes: Instructional supplies and tangible materials will be purchased to support the enhancement of the PBIS process. Money from PTSA and fundraising will also be used.			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	1000E	4330	0021 - Stuart Middle School	Other		$3,000.00
			Notes: Teachers and admin will participate in AVID training to ensure an effective implementation of the program.			

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	$0.00
		Total:	$10,000.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes