School District of Indian River County

Storm Grove Middle School

2022-23 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: 6/14/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	42%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (56%) 2020-21: (52%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (53%)
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 was approved by the Indian River County School Board on 10/24/2022.

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.

School Leadership Team

Membership
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.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Taylor, Christopher	Principal	
Duchemin, Dawn	Assistant Principal	
Bethel, Robyn	Assistant Principal	
Esposito, Tabetha	Assistant Principal	
Nasci, Maria	Reading Coach	
Demeter, Nancy	Math Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/14/2022, Christopher Taylor

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
4

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
47

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
66

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,014

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
13

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	365	327	324	0	0	0	0	1016
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	90	79	0	0	0	0	235
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	30	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	69	24	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	41	54	0	0	0	0	144
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	48	53	0	0	0	0	158
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 10/21/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of sutdents with a substantial reading deficiency		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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	327	316	352	0	0	0	0	995
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	60	64	0	0	0	0	167
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	26	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	57	0	0	0	0	74
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	55	28	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	57	82	0	0	0	0	186
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	55	75	0	0	0	0	181
Number of sutdents with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	57	82	0	0	0	0	186

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	28	54	73	0	0	0	0	155

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	9	5	6	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	0	0	0	0	13

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	51%	48%	50%	55%			54%	54%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	45%	48%	53%			54%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	34%	38%	37%			42%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	56%	51%	54%	55%			56%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	54%	53%	58%	44%			52%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	57%	55%	35%			38%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	55%	50%	49%	55%			49%	53%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	71%	67%	71%	70%			67%	72%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2022					
	2019	56%	52%	4%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	52%	51%	1%	52%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
08	2022					
	2019	53%	53%	0%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	55%	53%	2%	55%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	59%	53%	6%	54%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2022					
	2019	39%	47%	-8%	46%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	48%	49%	-1%	48%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	66%	69%	-3%	71%	-5%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	97%	58%	39%	61%	36%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	16	32	29	23	43	49	16	33	45		
ELL	18	32	28	32	43	52	13	48			
ASN	80	70									
BLK	34	33	21	36	44	41	44	43	75		
HSP	37	39	36	49	52	58	46	46	76		
MUL	47	48		56	69	82	40	74	53		
WHT	58	48	39	62	55	57	60	83	80		
FRL	38	36	32	43	49	56	43	60	71		

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	16	30	24	22	30	27	13	25	10		
ELL	32	43	37	39	38	38	29	43	56		
ASN	100	83		83	75						
BLK	38	48	39	28	29	21	33	44	47		
HSP	45	47	38	49	38	32	40	65	49		
MUL	48	53	69	53	43	21	60	65	85		
WHT	62	56	30	61	49	46	64	77	65		
FRL	43	48	34	41	37	33	44	59	50		

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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	562
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

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

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	75
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	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	59

Multiracial Students	
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	60
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	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ELA:
There is a strong correlation between students' BOY FAST scores and their first iReady Reading Diagnostic progress with a 2% difference in favor of FAST 1. Students tend to rush through and not take iReady lessons and diagnostics as seriously as state assessments or grade-level instruction (11% rushed through the reading diagnostic). It was also taken over multiple days in a variety of classrooms and test settings.
Students who scored a 2.5 on last year's FSA Reading, only scored a 1 on the BOY FAST. This is expected since FAST is on the end-of-year standards.

Math:
Our data from i Ready should be fairly accurate as only 31 students out of 704 received a rush flag.

i Ready Diagnostic Data tells us that of the 6th-grade students 25% are at risk for Tier 3 Intervention, 42% 7th graders, and 36% of the 8th graders.

FAST PM1 shows that in all grade levels the majority of students were at levels 1 and 2. 6th (84%) 7th (87%) and 8th (97%)

In 8th-grade math, 92% of ESE students are below grade level and 100% of our ELL's below grade level. 7th reflects 100% of ESE students and 67% of ELL's below grade level. 6th grade ELL's are at 100% and ESE are 92% below grade level.

Algebra and Geometry students outscored the district in both areas on the 1st progress monitoring test for the quarter. Both SWD and ELL's scored above the district average.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA: iReady Reading Diagnostic 1:
42% of students are at risk for tier 3 intervention
The greatest need for improvement is Comprehension of Informational Text: 69% scored below grade level

Math: i Ready Fall Diagnostic
47% of students are at risk for Tier 3 Intervention
Across the board Algebra and Algebraic Reasoning and Geometry are the biggest need according to the i Ready Fall Diagnostic

2.5 bucket students and low level 3's. Our ESSA groups, ELL's and SWD need significant need for improvement. A lot of these students are at risk for Tier 3 Intervention.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

ELA: Contributing Factors:
Students tend to rush through diagnostic and not give full effort on iReady
For the 2.5 FSA students, it is unlikely to be proficient (or as close to proficiency) on end-of-course standards at the beginning of the school year.

ELA: New Actions to Take to Address Need for Improvement:
Data Chats and goal setting with teachers before and after iReady diagnostic
Literacy Coach data chats with 2.5 students once a quarter about all reading progress (last year's FSA, iReady, FAST, grades)
A2 initiative
Reading and ELA teachers pulling small groups
Critical Thinking content focused on Informational texts

Math: Contributing factors

FAST: Tested on standards not taught.
Standards realignment within the BEST across grade levels causing gaps in learning.
At time of i Ready and FAST PM1 no calculators were allowed on certain questions and benchmarks and now calculator is allowed on all questions.
Students that were not at mastery as of the FSA 2022 were already below grade level.
Loss of learning over the summer.
ELL's and SWD at a significant disadvantage due to their disabilities

Math: New Actions

Continued PD for teachers on BEST Benchmarks and Clarifications
Support for students and teachers on the realignment and loss of learning and movement of benchmarks between grade levels.
Calculator fluency for students.
Coaching teachers on pulling small groups, identifying gaps in students, and 2.5 bucket students.
Data chats.
Work closely with ELL and ESE support.
Foundational Classes to close the gaps.
Building Thinking Classrooms.
A2 Initiative

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA: According to the Reading Standards Mastery 1, students are scoring higher on vocabulary than they have in previous years.

Math: Algebraic Reasoning and Geometry

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

ELA: Factors that contributed to the vocabulary improvement include:
Daily use of the Amplify Vocabulary App in ELA
Teaching of specific vocabulary words in all content areas
Deliberate teaching of context clues in ELA and Reading
Lexia Word Study in Intensive Reading
STEAM Lessons
Critical Thinking to support tested subjects

ELA: New Actions Taken include:
Word part analysis and synthetization in Intensive Reading

Math: Factors Contributing
Intensive Math 2022 and Foundational Skills this 2023 year
Students coming in with better math fact fluency and continuing on
i Ready Pathway and teacher-assigned lessons - focusing on minutes and lessons passed and limiting the number of lessons opened to just 1
Tutoring by teachers afternoon and at lunches and by coach supporting these students in classroom walk-throughs

Math: New Actions Taken
Small group rotations and support for teachers in gen ed classes on standards being taught. Adaptive programs such as Prodigy and the continued use of i Ready pathway were being implemented into rotations.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

ELA:
Student Motivation
Student self-efficacy

Teachers identify bubble students and plan specifically for their needs,
Data chats with teachers/coach,
Teacher encouragement
Building groups and pulling small groups based on data,
A2 tutoring initiative,
Teachers pull small groups to meet with all students at least once a week

Math:
Data chats on i Ready info with teachers and students and District PM's with Acceleration students providing celebrations and incentives.
Identification of 2.5 students and data chats with them as well as small groups with these students and teaching to the level and not down.
Spiraling of benchmarks.
Monitoring and Formative Assessment will increase
Continued proficiency with the calculators to provide more time for engagement, application, and analysis, which will lead to avoiding the time-consuming factor of lack of proficiency with procedural/ algorithm accuracy.
Strategic pulling of small groups based on Monitoring and Formative Assessment.
A2 Iniative

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

ELA:
Weekly Collaborative Planning to include strategies for bubble students
Creating mid lesson Formative Assessments
Grouping according to Data

Math:
Weekly Collaborative planning using the BEST B1G M to identify clarifications for benchmarks to not overteach or underteach benchmarks. Focusing on the Instructional Tasks to create deeper thinking and Instructional Items for monitoring and formative assessment. Using the Strategies for Tiered Instruction that are provided by the state in this B1G M along with others.
Data will be consistently provided after all PM's, both state and district, to help inform leaders of school/ student status and guide teacher instruction and differentiation for support and success.
Continued PD on new curriculum and implementation. Identifying ways to extract data and use data from the curriculum Module assessments and use to differentiate for small groups.
Identify areas of gaps and students with gaps due to new standards/realignment vertically (BEST) and identification of strands that tend to have the most need for improvement.
Support teachers with resources and current resources to fill those gaps.
Focus on 2.5 bucket students and low level 3's to support proficiency with tutoring, data chats, and support in the classroom as a coach and keep the names of those students in the forefront of teachers when they are planning.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

ELA:
Collaborative planning
Coaching cycles
Implementation of district approved curriculum
Teachers identify bubble students and plan specifically for their needs,
Teacher encouragement

Data chats with teachers/coach,
Building groups and pulling small groups based on data,
A2 tutoring initiative,
Teachers pull small groups to meet with all students at least once a week

Math:
Classroom walkthroughs by coach and feedback to teachers after those as well as district walkthroughs.
Participation in STEAM activities across curriculums to support math in all subject areas.
Provision of data to teachers from assessments.
A2 tutoring initiative.
Coaching cycles and Mini Cycles
Continued teacher assistance while walking through with students and their academics and mindset.
Data Chats with students in the 2.5 and low 3 buckets.
i Ready Data chats with all students by teachers and PM's by district with Accelerated students.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Due to the fact that this year's focus is solely on achievement, the choice was made to focus on the 2.5 students and low 3's in Math to maintain or increase their achievement levels. The data on the FSA 2022 identifies that SGMS has approximately 104 math students in the 2.5 bucket. There are also a large group of low 3's that need to maintain or improve proficiency.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	2.5 bucket students will increase proficiency by 70%, and 70% of level 3's or higher will maintain or increase. Math overall will increase their proficiency from 56% to 61%
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Classroom visits, feedback, shareouts in Collaborative Plan, tracking student progress (both teacher and student self-monitoring), i Ready Standards Mastery, i Ready Diagnostics, FAST Monitoring, District Progress Monitorings and McGraw Hill Module Diagnostics and Assessments. Coaching data chats will also be used with teachers singularly within Coaching Cycles and Teacher Assistance focusing on monitoring and formative assessment and what is being done with the outcomes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nancy Demeter (nancy.demeter@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Monitoring and Formative Assessments
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Monitoring and Formative Assessments lead to awareness of students that are not meeting the standard and a means to Tiered Instruction, spiraling back, reteaching, pulling small groups, tutoring, and overall awareness of where students are as a result of instruction and level of understanding. This is a path toward proficiency.

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.

Promoting buy-in from teachers by involving them in the data analysis and identification of areas of needs/ concerns of their own students including problem-solving with the support of a coach if needed and any other support staff appropriate.
Through Coaching Cycles, rather full or mini, or teacher assistance, provide and keep on the forefront evidence of monitoring/formative assessment observed from the district and/or coach.
Support to promote monitoring and formative assessment when not observed in walkthroughs and/or coaching cycles.
Discussions and shareouts of forms of formative/monitoring, successes/failures, and results alluding to follow-through strategies that lead to proficiency.
Participate in the A2 program to provide opportunities for student achievement
Classroom visits by teachers to see monitoring and formative assessment being used effectively.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Due to the fact that this year's focus is solely on achievement, the choice was made to focus on the 2.5 students and low 3's in ELA to maintain or increase their achievement levels. The data on the FSA 2022 identifies that SGMS has approximately 107 ELA students in the 2.5 bucket. There are also a large group of low 3's that need to maintain or improve proficiency.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	2.5 bucket students will increase proficiency by 70%, and 70% of level 3's or higher will maintain or increase. Overall, ELA will increase their proficiency to 56%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Classroom visits, feedback, shareouts in Collaborative Plan, tracking student progress (both teacher and student self-monitoring), iReady Standards Mastery, iReady Diagnostics, FAST Monitoring, and Amplify Assessments. Coaching data chats will also be used with teachers singularly within Coaching Cycles and Teacher Assistance focusing on monitoring and formative assessment and what is being done with the outcomes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Maria Nasci (maria.nasci@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Monitoring and Formative Assessments
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Monitoring and Formative Assessments lead to awareness of students that are not meeting the standard and a means to Tiered Instruction, spiraling back, reteaching, pulling small groups, tutoring, and overall awareness of where students are as a result of instruction and level of understanding. This is a path toward proficiency.

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.

Promoting buy-in from teachers by involving them in the data analysis and identification of areas of needs/ concerns of their own students including problem-solving with the support of a coach if needed and any other support staff appropriate.
Through Coaching Cycles, rather full or mini, or teacher assistance, provide and keep on the forefront

evidence of monitoring/formative assessment observed from the district and/or coach.
Support to promote monitoring and formative assessment when not observed in walkthroughs and/or coaching cycles.
Discussions and shareouts of forms of formative/monitoring, successes/failures, and results alluding to follow-through strategies that lead to proficiency.
Participate in the A2 program to provide opportunities for student achievement
2.5 quarterly Student Data Chats with Literacy Coach

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

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Data Findings:
-First Quarter Average Daily Attendance 93.8%
-By Grade Level:
6th – 94.7%
7th – 93.%
8th – 92.8%
- 157 Office Disciplinary Referrals
- 6 students received an Out of School Suspension

Rational for Selection of Data:
- Increasing ADA will result in students being in the classroom for instruction.
- By receiving fewer referrals, students feel valued and a part of the classroom community to support students' emotional and academic needs.
- We want to reduce OSS to keep our students in school to better support our students.

Hield Yield Strategy: Building Relationships

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

(Assistant Principal)
- Uniformed usage of Stringray credits
- Classroom incentives to increase ADA
- PBIS Drawing using tickets

(Principal)
- Hold "Student Advisory Council" MANTAS