

School District of Indian River County

# Storm Grove Middle School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Storm Grove Middle School

6400 57TH ST, Vero Beach, FL 32967

www.indianriverschools.org

## Demographics

**Principal: Anne Bieber**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

<b>2019-20 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>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (56%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Indian River County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Storm Grove Middle School

6400 57TH ST, Vero Beach, FL 32967

[www.indianriverschools.org](http://www.indianriverschools.org)

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 6-8</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>51%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>39%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
<b>Grade</b>	C	C	B	B

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Indian River County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

At Storm Grove Middle School, we instill a passion for learning and inspire our students to believe in themselves. The mission of Storm Grove Middle is to prepare all students to be successful and productive citizens as we strive for excellence through exemplary teaching which is conducive for learners to increase their academic achievement in all core subject areas of English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies as evidenced in measurable educational gains. We seek to do this in a safe, nurturing environment by developing positive relationships within the school, family, and community

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

As facilitators of knowledge, we will be innovators in the ways we motivate students and enhance their character to prepare them for their future. Storm Grove Middle sets high expectations for social, emotional and academic learning, providing students with a rigorous curriculum supported by evidence-based, effective teaching practices to raise student achievement for all and guide students toward college and career readiness. Respect and positive interaction are the basis for a collaborative culture and a successful learning environment. We have established core values of being respectful, responsible, role models. These values are the foundation for a positive school climate and reflected in relationships at SGMS. At Storm Grove we challenge ourselves by: trusting the process, believing in the vision, and having the courage to change.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bieber, Anne	Principal	Provides the instructional leadership that ensures the commitment to data-driven decision making and continual strategic planning. The principal also ensures the implementation of the MTSS/RTI process and provides the necessary development for its success.
Foster, Keandra	Assistant Principal	Facilitate the effective implementation of the goals and objectives delineated by the principal and leadership team. Both ensure that the instructional programs are monitored and modified with efficacy while providing support for the total instructional and non-instructional staff.
Corby, Kim	Teacher, K-12	Department Heads: Facilitate implementation of effective instruction within their departments as directed by principal (or other administrator). Helps monitor efficacy and fidelity of school-wide instructional best practices.
Martinelli, Joan	Teacher, K-12	Department Heads: Facilitate implementation of effective instruction within their departments as directed by principal (or other administrator). Helps monitor efficacy and fidelity of school-wide instructional best practices.
Nathaniel, Shana	Teacher, K-12	Department Heads: Facilitate implementation of effective instruction within their departments as directed by principal (or other administrator). Helps monitor efficacy and fidelity of school-wide instructional best practices.
Robinson, Eddie	Assistant Principal	Facilitate the effective implementation of the goals and objectives delineated by the principal and leadership team. Both ensure that the instructional programs are monitored and modified with efficacy while providing support for the total instructional and non-instructional staff.
Duchemin, Dawn	Assistant Principal	Facilitate the effective implementation of the goals and objectives delineated by the principal and leadership team. Both ensure that the instructional programs are monitored and modified with efficacy while providing support for the total instructional and non-instructional staff.
Nasci, Maria	Teacher, K-12	Department Heads: Facilitate implementation of effective instruction within their departments as directed by principal (or other administrator). Helps monitor efficacy and fidelity of school-wide instructional best practices.

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**



Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	357	350	375	0	0	0	0	1082
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	51	73	0	0	0	0	172
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	33	50	0	0	0	0	88
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	41	109	0	0	0	0	153
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	82	111	0	0	0	0	298
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	48	100	0	0	0	0	174

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	6

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

61

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 7/25/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	54%	54%	54%	55%	51%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	55%	54%	52%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	42%	47%	36%	37%	44%
Math Achievement	56%	60%	58%	58%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	52%	59%	57%	59%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	50%	51%	44%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	49%	53%	51%	57%	50%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	72%	72%	79%	71%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	357 (0)	350 (0)	375 (0)	1082 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	48 ( )	51 ( )	73 ( )	172 (0)
One or more suspensions	5 (0)	33 (0)	50 (0)	88 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 (0)	41 (0)	109 (0)	153 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	105 (0)	82 (0)	111 (0)	298 (0)
5	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
06	2019	56%	52%	4%	54%	2%
	2018	46%	48%	-2%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	52%	51%	1%	52%	0%
	2018	45%	44%	1%	51%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	53%	53%	0%	56%	-3%
	2018	55%	55%	0%	58%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	55%	53%	2%	55%	0%
	2018	56%	51%	5%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	59%	53%	6%	54%	5%
	2018	56%	52%	4%	54%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	39%	47%	-8%	46%	-7%
	2018	60%	51%	9%	45%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	48%	49%	-1%	48%	0%
	2018	56%	53%	3%	50%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	66%	69%	-3%	71%	-5%
2018	65%	65%	0%	71%	-6%
Compare		1%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	58%	39%	61%	36%
2018	98%	61%	37%	62%	36%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%
2018	100%	50%	50%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

**Subgroup Data**

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	25	36	28	23	31	25	25	36	23		
ELL	29	47	52	41	46	56	15	42	40		
ASN	100	100		92	92						
BLK	42	49	44	37	39	26	22	54	16		
HSP	43	49	41	49	44	44	30	56	33		
MUL	46	47	32	50	51	43	33	60	58		
WHT	61	56	44	62	57	39	59	74	39		
FRL	42	48	42	45	46	36	36	53	28		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	13	35	36	31	51	47	16	40	9		
ELL	16	40	55	19	44	50		27			
ASN	73	64		82	82						
BLK	31	41	39	38	51	47	33	54	33		
HSP	39	53	56	52	61	50	53	57	42		
MUL	48	56	50	50	56	43	58	50			
WHT	56	48	34	70	70	48	64	72	40		
FRL	36	44	42	49	58	44	39	54	26		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	19	37	30	26	44	40	19	59			
ELL	15	29	27	22	49	36		28			
ASN	79	73		79	67				70		
BLK	32	40	30	29	39	38	30	66			
HSP	51	47	34	52	57	41	37	72	26		
MUL	50	43		44	55	45	40	80			
WHT	61	56	41	66	63	50	66	85	57		
FRL	39	43	35	43	51	45	39	70	29		

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	37
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	487
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	96
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	47
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The data component that performed the lowest is Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%. It is a two-year trend: 48% and 38% respectively.

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

The component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is Math Gains dropping from 61% to 56%. 8th grade math had a 30 point decline from the previous 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.

The data component that had the biggest gap when compared to the state average is our math lowest 25th percentile. 13 point decrease when compared to the state average.

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

The data component that had the most improvement was 7th grade ELA which was a 7 percentage increase. The actions that led to this improvement was ELA Bootcamp that was held on Saturdays before FSA to help prepare students. Improvement in the area was a result of utilizing collaborative learning and planning (CLP) time as well as placing an emphasis on reaching all students. Through the use of CLP time teachers met to plan out resources and lessons to ensure that all students were being exposed to high levels of instruction

#### Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Two potential areas of concerns reflecting upon the EWS data: Course Failure in ELA or Math for 8th grade students (109 students out of 375). Another concern would be students that received a Level 1 on State wide assessment for 6th grade 105 students out 357 of and 8th grade 111 students out of 375.

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

1. 8th grade Math, state 46 and we were 39 (-7) versus last year we were at 60
2. Lowest Quartile students
3. Science

- 4. ELA scores
- 5. Social Studies

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Building relationships with students, focused on attendance and behavior referrals
<b>Rationale</b>	Instructional time is protected and students who disrupt the learning environment are then losing their own instructional time. This directly impacts our school's proficiency in all content areas. Reduce the amount of office referrals due to disruptive behavior that leads to lack of instructional time. Attendance is critical to student success, by increasing attendance we can maximize student learning.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Decrease the number of students with one or more suspensions and provide emotional and mental health support for students in need. Reduce student disruption to instruction resulting in discipline referrals by 10%. School goal is to decrease the number of absences by 10% compared to the previous school year.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Eddie Robinson (eddie.robinson@indianriverschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Teachers will created a classroom management plan. teach it to their students and enforce it regularly. Integrate PBIS lesson plans for school-wide implementation. Posters of PBIS for hallway transitions are posted throughout the school. Emphasize SEL behaviors that stress emotional control. Professional development Training will be given to the teachers on equity, empathy and cultural competence in hopes of developing a better understanding of our student body. Student climate surveys will be given as a baseline data and again throughout the year.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Feedback evaluations and surveys from students and staff
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remind and reward students for perfect attendance each 9 weeks</li> <li>2. Teachers and staff call home for attendance and behavior issues</li> <li>3 . Implementing Positive Behavior Intervention Support plan school wide</li> <li>4. Implementing Homebase on Thursdays during 6th period focusing on kindness challenge and social emotional learning activities with all students</li> <li>5. Providing mental health support on school campus</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Dawn Duchemin (dawn.duchemin@indianriverschools.org)



<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Professional Development on standards based instruction
<b>Rationale</b>	Focusing on data-driven instruction model to provide more differentiated and focused instruction for students with disabilities, African american students, Hispanic students, and Economically disadvantage students. With students all performing at different levels, standards, teachers will use data to drive their instruction based on state level assessment, district level assessments, iReady, and teacher made formative assessments
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The measurable outcome of collaborative planning will be to develop stronger lessons that will concentrate on standards, focusing on differentiating for the bottom quartile students. This will lead to an increased student achievement and learning gains for students in the lowest quartile for students in Math and ELA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Keandra Foster (keandra.foster@indianriverschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	collaborative planning, professional development, action plans and feedback given during informal/formal observations
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Specific support for students in the sub groups that fall below the 41% proficiency will be specifically addressed during collaborative planning and professional development
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Qualitative data is collected through lesson plan review and review of assessments. Quantitative data will be collected through collaborative planning team data chats and teacher observation.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Facilitate professional development on problem solving process and root cause analysis</li> <li>2. Train teachers on how to analyze and pull their own data to determine Tier I instruction effectiveness</li> <li>3. Teachers will participate in professional development through data chats through their department and collaborative planning understanding the data and "bucket" their students.</li> <li>4. Through the school year with the school Professional Development Days, the school will facilitate collaborative learning sessions and support focused on formative assessments.</li> <li>5. School will monitor the use of i-ready, as well as overall passing rates of lesson. Student progress will also be measures through growth monitoring sessions and diagnostics.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Keandra Foster (keandra.foster@indianriverschools.org)

<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Increasing student engagement by implementing data-driven differentiated instruction
<b>Rationale</b>	Teachers are continuing to deepen their knowledge on how to implement and design data-driven differentiated instruction with accountability, aligned to the rigor and depth of the Florida Standards. ELA lowest 25% percentile and Math lowest 25% percentile were below the state average, it is evident that teachers need further development in designing instruction based on data in which targets specific student needs and maximizes students instructional time. Current data for subgroup category proficiency: SWD: 28% , Black/ African American: 37%, Hispanic: 40% and Economically Disadvantaged: 40%.  Teachers will be able to guide students in tracking progress and setting goals, improving academic accountability over time. Strengthening differentiated practices and organizing small group instruction with regularity. The outcome is to increase school-wide learning gains in ELA and Math with the lowest quartile students by the end of the school year.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Math: Our grade-level math percentage achieving at least level 3 on the FSA: 6th grade: 55 % , 7th grade: 59% and 8th grade: 39%. Goal will be for 50% of Pre-Algebra as there are currently not any proficient students enrolled in those courses. The math department will be for at least 65% proficiency for all grade levels and math subjects.  ELA: Increase the percentage of students making learning gains in the lowest quartile in ELA from 42% to 47% which is the state average.  Science: Students will increase Science Achievement goals from 49% to 53% which is the district average. The state average was 51% for 2019.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Keandra Foster (keandra.foster@indianriverschools.org)  Collaborative learning sessions and Professional development opportunities geared toward differentiation practices. Actionable feedback and guiding students in tracking progress from formative assessments including goal setting from the Stingray Data Tracking Form.
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	ELA, Math and Science department will be planning vertically as a department to ensure that concepts such as solving equations are taught using similar vocabulary and methods as it is a heavily tested standard throughout middle school. ELA, Math and Science department will meet during common planning by grade as well as department, to review and analyze the data from common assessments such as District unit assessments.  Students in the ESSA subgroups falling below 41% proficiency will have one on one conferences with a teacher during their home-base period to review goals, strategies for success and additional supports such as Tuesday after school tutoring
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Quantitative data will be collected through collaborative planning team data chats and teacher observation.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	1. Math department will request that teachers school-wide give their students grades in fraction form such as 37/50 so that the students will have multiple opportunities for

repeated practice of changing fractions to decimals and percent.

2. Math department will work with science teachers incorporate concepts relating to measures of central tendency such as mean, median, and mode. We will ask them to reinforce math standards of representing information in more than one way (table, words, equations, graph), and use concepts of dependent and independent variables, not only as they relate to science but to math as well.

3. ELA will focus on Key Ideas and Details cluster when planning lessons, student annotations while reading

4 .ELA will use FSA question stems and specs to purposefully expose students to FSA format

5. ELA will utilize ACES—cross curricular writing strategy to prepare students to fully answer short answer response questions and to lay the foundation for essay writing.

**Person Responsible**

Anne Bieber (anne.bieber@indianriverschools.org)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

N/A

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

N/A

#### PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

N/A

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

**Part V: Budget**

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Building relationships with students, focused on attendance and behavior referrals	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Professional Development on standards based instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increasing student engagement by implementing data-driven differentiated instruction	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>