Storm Grove Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Storm Grove Middle School

6400 57TH ST, Vero Beach, FL 32967

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Taylor

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2020

2019-20 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	42%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	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.

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 strive to Inspire and Empower ALL students to maximize their full potential in Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math creating a pathway to become responsible citizens and Successful Innovative Leaders

Provide the school's vision statement.

Storm Grove was built on land important to the heritage of Indian River County and established under a Green School Initiative. We want our students to become Stewards of our Global Community through their Knowledge and Leadership.

Guiding Principles
Develop the leaders of tomorrow through meaningful relationships and provide opportunities to ALL students through academics, athletics, technology, the arts, and career readiness experiences. We know that ALL of our students will succeed as they lead by example following our values of Respect, Responsibility, and being a Role Model.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.
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.
	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	Instructional Coach	Facilitate and support standards based Lesson Planning, design and implement coaching cycles with evidenced based instructional strategies to enhance teacher and learning. Analyze and interpret data in collaboration with teachers to drive decision making within Academic Programs. Provide job-embedded professional development opportunities to stakeholders aligned to student assessment data. Support the development and implementation of Intervention and Enrichment programs.
Demeter, Nancy	Instructional Coach	Facilitate and support standards based Lesson Planning, design and implement coaching cycles with evidenced based instructional strategies to enhance teacher and learning. Analyze and interpret data in collaboration with teachers to drive decision making within Academic Programs. Provide job-embedded professional development opportunities to stakeholders aligned to student assessment data. Support the development and implementation of Intervention and Enrichment programs.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/2/2020, Christopher Taylor

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
59

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	42%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	319	359	359	0	0	0	0	1037
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	51	60	0	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	29	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	16	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	46	50	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	56	55	0	0	0	0	144
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	15	60	0	0	0	0	105

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	6	51	66	0	0	0	0	123

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	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/27/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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	
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

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

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	
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

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

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**	
	(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.

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%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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		

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
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 was sixth to eighth grade students scoring a Level 1 is FSA math. In 2018, the data showed 16% were level 1 and in 2019 13% were level 1. The contributing factors to last year's low performance were our Lowest Quartile in math included:

providing differentiated professional development to our teachers and modeling of instructional practices for our teachers.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline is our math learning gains, a decline of 13 percentage points. During the 2018-19 school year, we had a significant number of new math teachers and inconsistent classroom instruction that the new math coach will be able to address.

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 which was 13 point gap when compared to the state average. The contributing factor, we had a significant number of new math teachers, not enough time teaching the standards but this year we are on a block schedule so we should see an increase in our math scores.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is ELA Learning Gains. There was a gain of 6 percentage points between 2018-2019 and 2019-20. The new actions taken were content area teachers assisted in covering ELA standards, Common Planning and and Co-Teach model.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

We identified two potential areas of concerns when reviewing our EWS data. First is the course failures for ELA for sixth to eighth grade students during 2018-2019 was 6% and in 2019-2020 was 4%. Second, the course failures for Math for sixth to eighth grade students during 2018-2019 was 12% and in 2019-2020 was 10%.

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

1. To increase lower quartile Math and ELA Scores
2. To increase ELA and Math learning gains across all grade levels
3. To increase Science proficiency
4. Improve outcomes for the ESSA identified subgroups in ELA & Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus is STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math.) This is a critical need because it is encourages problem solving skills, independent thinking, fosters ingenuity and creativity, and offers an interdisciplinary approach. The data reviewed showed that with content areas using an interdisciplinary approach to foster exposure, there was increase in ELA gains for level 1 students from 6-8th grade. This approach is being selected to ensure that these gains are achieved across all content areas.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is an increase in FCAT Science 8th grade students by 4% and FSA Math by 4%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anne Bieber (anne.bieber@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math) is an effective approach to interdisciplinary learning. This approach is shown to be effective because non-title I schools improved by 22% when using a steam lesson. Research also shows that math scores increase 17 percent in 2008 to 66 percent in 2015. (Learnitbyart.com) According to educationdive.com, students that received blocks of STEAM instruction went from the 50th percentile to the 63rd percentile on their district's science assessment. ELL student showed biggest gain from the STEAM focused programs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rational for selecting a STEAM approach is to increase test scores across all subject areas. This strategy not only increases academic performance, but is proven to improve classroom behavior, creativity, and it is inclusive and specifically helps our English Language Learner students (learnitbyart.com).

Action Steps to Implement

Trained staff on STEAM strategies through our school based professional development day held on 8/12/2020.

Person Responsible	Dawn Duchemin (dawn.duchemin@indianriverschools.org)

Administration will track and monitor ESSA group students : Students with disabilities, Black students, Hispanic Students and Economically disadvantaged students through IReady and Unit assessments.

Person Responsible	Anne Bieber (anne.bieber@indianriverschools.org)

Vertical planning will be held monthly and horizontal planning for subject areas and grade levels will be held weekly.

Person Responsible	Anne Bieber (anne.bieber@indianriverschools.org)

Instructional coaches between ELA and math will be able to coordinate resources and coaching for Science teachers.

Person Responsible	Nancy Demeter (nancy.demeter@indianriverschools.org)

Each grade level will produce a STEAM based project each nine weeks across all subjects

Person Responsible	Joan Martinelli (joan.martinelli@indianriverschools.org)

Elective classes will also incorporate STEAM based lesson plans each nine weeks.

Person Responsible Dawn Duchemin (dawn.duchemin@indianriverschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus is Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports. This is going to be achieved through working with the students on mindfulness, motivating students through the use of Stingray credits, learning about the hierarchy of needs with a focus on safety, and promoting core social and emotional competencies. This is a determined need after reviewing discipline data during the 2019-20 school. In all, 622 Office Discipline referrals were written last school year between August and March.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is fewer office discipline referrals. The 2019-2020 school year office discipline referrals were 622. To demonstrate that PBIS is working, the office discipline referrals will not exceed 75 referrals per nine weeks.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Keandra Foster (keandra.foster@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based practice of adding mindfulness into classrooms shows that 89% of improve emotional regulation, 83% improve focus, 79% improve engagement. At the same time it improves educations connecting with students (https://www.mindfulschools.org/about-mindfulness/research-on-mindfulness/). Including the hierarchy of needs will increase the child's self esteem which concludes successful learning on the part of the student (Waschull and Kernis 1996). Confident students with appropriate levels of self esteem seem to be motivated and they tend to not cause discipline problems (Marchant 1991). PBIS support positive climate and safety, classroom discipline and management, student self management, and interventions for students exhibiting social, emotional, and behavior challenges (nea.org, Positive Behavioral Intervention Supports: A multi-tiered framework that works for every student.).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports is to improve student's emotional regulation and self esteem in order for them to achieve higher academically and decrease their discipline problems.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a PBIS committee and make sure teachers and students are up to date on protocols for PBIS as evidenced by first meeting on 09/15/2020. Each meeting will be held each month for the rest of the school year.

Person Responsible	Keandra Foster (keandra.foster@indianriverschools.org)

Implement a block schedule to minimize transitions as well as allow teachers time during classroom instruction to build meaningful relationships with students.

Person Responsible	Anne Bieber (anne.bieber@indianriverschools.org)

Implement an In School Suspension program. This will minimize out of school suspension. ISS will only be "opened" on certain days as needed and not used as a punitive measure. The Success Coach will monitor ISS and work with students to analyze and reflect on their behavior and develop strategies to move towards positive behavior.

Person Responsible	Keandra Foster (keandra.foster@indianriverschools.org)

Hire a Success Coach to implement ISS as well as work with students and teachers. On days when there is not a specific student in ISS the Success Coach will be in classrooms to support positive behaviors. They will also be able to support and provide professional development for those teachers who need to grow their Tier 1 interventions and relationships with students.

Person Responsible Anne Bieber (anne.bieber@indianriverschools.org)

During 10 Days of Unity, create and employ lessons and practices to give to teachers for implementation in the classroom.

Person Responsible Maria Nasci (maria.nasci@indianriverschools.org)

Administration will track and monitor ESSA group students : Students with disabilities, Black students, Hispanic Students and Economically disadvantaged students through office discipline referrals.

Person Responsible Anne Bieber (anne.bieber@indianriverschools.org)

Utilize "home base" to reinforce positive behaviors throughout the year on a Tier 1 level

Person Responsible Keandra Foster (keandra.foster@indianriverschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By delivering effective, rigorous and relevant instruction to meet the needs of all students, we will increase in learning gains for students scoring in the lowest 25% on ELA FSA. Our Learning gains for students scoring in the lowest 25% was the same (42%) from 2018 to 2019 on the ELA FSA. Our I-Ready Reading scores for Fall/Winter showed 49% of all of students making typical growth. Trends in the data identify the need to improve the instructional model used with the lowest 25% population.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome is to increase learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA by 10% as measured by ELA FSA 2020-21. We will increase our 7th grade from 57% to 62% making gains through the I-Ready reading program as well.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Maria Nasci (maria.nasci@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidenced based strategies being implemented would include: small group instruction (www.readingrockets.org) professional collaborations (https://www.ldatschool.ca/) and data-driven instruction to the instructional model (https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED577250) Differentiated through technology strategies that would be assigned on Canvas such as Read Works, News ELA and Common Literature.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	I-Ready is a district supported program researched and proven to provide literacy learning and differentiated instructional support to increase reading performance for individual student needs of struggling readers, English language learners and students with other disabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional Coach to provide professional development to teachers in classroom support, modeling, team collaboration and planning support, assist to monitor instructional delivery and data as well as provide teachers with timely instructional feedback.

Person Responsible	Maria Nasci (maria.nasci@indianriverschools.org)

Administrators will conduct weekly walk-throughs and observations in order to provide teachers with timely, individual feedback to teachers on how to improve their instruction.

Person Responsible	Anne Bieber (anne.bieber@indianriverschools.org)

Administrators will conduct data chats with teachers individually and groups of teachers. With their department and grade level teams, teachers will have student data chats to better inform their instruction.

Person Responsible	Anne Bieber (anne.bieber@indianriverschools.org)

New teachers will be assigned mentors and provided support to build their teaching capacity.

Person Responsible	Dawn Duchemin (dawn.duchemin@indianriverschools.org)

To monitor effectiveness Coaches will complete a log of support services provided. Other evidence will include Team Collaboration agendas and notes, PD agendas and notes, meeting discussions with administrators, observation notes.

Person Responsible	Anne Bieber (anne.bieber@indianriverschools.org)

Administration will track and monitor all identified ESSA subgroups, Students with disabilities, Black students, Hispanic students and Economically Disadvantaged students through I-Ready and Unit Assessments quarterly.

Person Responsible Anne Bieber (anne.bieber@indianriverschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By delivering effective, rigorous and relevant instruction to meet the needs of all students, we will increase in learning gains for students scoring in the lowest 25% on Math FSA. The rationale as of 2019-20 our Learning Gains for students scoring in the lowest 25% decreased from 2018 to 2019 on the Math FSA from 48% in 2018 to 38% in 2019. Our I-Ready Math Fall to Winter scores showed 38% for students making typical growth. The trends in the data identify the need to improve the instructional model used with the lowest 25% population.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome is to increase learning gains of the lowest 25% Math FSA is to increase learning gains for the lowest 25% by 14% by Math FSA 2020-21. We would like to increase our 7th grade from 56% to 63% making gains through the I-Ready math program as well.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nancy Demeter (nancy.demeter@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidenced based strategies being implemented would include: small group instruction (Goldenberg,1993) professional collaborations and data-driven instruction to the instructional model (IPS Practice Guide)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	I-Ready is a district supported program researched and proven to provide online, personalized instruction and practice to promote productive struggle to help ALL learners achieve proficiency. I-Ready accelerates growth for key students groups such as: English Learners (EL), Students with disabilities (SWD), and Students with socioeconomic disadvantages (SED) receiving I-Ready personalized instructions all saw significantly greater growth than students from the same subgroups who not have access to the program during the school year.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional Coach to provide professional development to teachers in classroom support, modeling, team collaboration and planning support, assist to monitor instructional delivery and data as well as provide teachers with timely instructional feedback.

Person Responsible	Nancy Demeter (nancy.demeter@indianriverschools.org)

Administrators will conduct weekly walk-throughs and observations in order to provide teachers with timely, individual feedback to teachers on how to improve their instruction.

Person Responsible	Anne Bieber (anne.bieber@indianriverschools.org)

Administrators will conduct data chats with teachers and groups of teachers. With their department and grade level teams, teachers will have student data chats to better inform their instruction

Person Responsible	Anne Bieber (anne.bieber@indianriverschools.org)

New teachers will be assigned mentors and provided support to build their teaching capacity.

Person Responsible	Dawn Duchemin (dawn.duchemin@indianriverschools.org)

To monitor effectiveness Coaches will complete a log of support services provided. Other evidence will include Team Collaboration agendas and notes, PD agendas and notes, meeting discussions with administrators, observation notes.

Person Responsible	Anne Bieber (anne.bieber@indianriverschools.org)

Administration will track and monitor all identified ESSA subgroups, Students with disabilities, Black students, Hispanic students and Economically Disadvantaged students through I-Ready and Unit Assessments quarterly.

Person Responsible	Anne Bieber (anne.bieber@indianriverschools.org)

For each grade level, teachers will provide tutoring within the day for identified ESSA subgroups, Students with disabilities, Black students, Hispanic students and Economically Disadvantaged students. This strategy has proven historically successful at our school in improving student learning.

Person Responsible	Anne Bieber (anne.bieber@indianriverschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Improvement in Instructional rigor & student engagement in the classrooms.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Storm Grove Middle School has created an area of Focus in Section III which addresses Positive Culture and Climate in greater depth than required in this section, please reference that section of the plan for this information

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				$6,611.55
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0371 - Storm Grove Middle School	Other		$6,611.55
			Notes: SGMS was awarded a High Impact Grant from the Education Foundation of Indian River County			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**				**$600.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0371 - Storm Grove Middle School	Other		$600.00
			Notes: PBIS fundraises to support the program			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$0.00**
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$7,211.55**