District Plan for Improvement

District Name:		LEA Code:	Year:
Martin County Schools		580	2015-2016
Superintendent Name (or Designee)	Dr. Chris Mansfield	**Superintendent (or Designee) Email**	cmansfield@martin.k12.nc.us

District Mission	The Martin County Board of Education is committed to ensuring that all students will be provided with a quality academic, technological, and challenging education in a safe, orderly, and productive environment in order that they may become contributing members in the 21st century global society.
District Vision	The Martin County Board of Education will provide students the educational skill sets as determined by the North Carolina State Board of Education to be college and/or career ready by graduation so that they may be successful in their chosen post-secondary endeavors.

Data Analysis: Give a brief description of the data sources your team analyzed and the root causes uncovered during the analysis. What was learned from the data review? How did these data inform decisions for school improvement initiatives? (to include TWC, EOG/EOC results, attendance, graduation rates, among other sources of data)

Demographic Data

Martin County is a Tier One county located in northeastern North Carolina approximately 80 miles from the coast and 25 miles from East Carolina University. As of July 1, 2014, the estimated population of Martin County was 23,454, a decline of 4.3% from the estimate population as of April 1, 2015. Martin County's population is also aging population. In 2014, 5.2% of the population was under 5 years of age (a decline of 0.5% from 2010) and 20.6% of the population was over 65 years of age (an increase of 3.0% from 2010). The distribution of the population by the U.S. Census categories of race is 55.0% White (including Hispanic or Latino); 42.9% Black; 0.4% American Indian or Alaska Native; 0.5% Asian; 0.2% Native Hawaiian and Other; and 1.0% Two or More Races. Among the population, 3.6% identified themselves as Hispanic or Latino. (http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/37/37117.html).

The Martin County School System currently operates 10 schools—two high schools, two middle schools, and six elementary schools. The 2nd month membership report for 2015-16 indicates a total Pre-K- 12 enrollment of 3,378. The distribution of the population of the district by race is <1% Asian, 52% Black, 8% Hispanic, <1% American Indian or Alaska Native; 3% 2 or more races; and 37% White. The distribution by gender is 51% Male and 49% Female. This represents a decrease in enrollment of approximately 14% since 2010 prompted by a declining population, the opening of several charter school in Martin as well as neighboring counties, and the opening of a Regional School. These three factors also caused a shift in the racial makeup of the school system. The distribution of the student population by race in 2010 was 48% Black, 3% Hispanic, 46% White, and 3% Other (Based on reports generated from Student Information Systems.)

Martin County Schools employed 504 full-time personnel in 2015 compared to 620 in 2010 (-19%): 258 full-time teachers, 32 full-time administrators, 41 certified support staff, and 173 classified staff members. The gender distribution of teachers is 18% Male and 82% Female. The racial distribution of teachers if 16% Black, 83% White, and 1% Other. Over the past five years, Martin County's teacher turnover rate has fluctuated from 9.67% in 2011 up to a high of 15.07% in 2013 and has now decreased over the past two years to 13.21% in 2014 and 9.65% in 2015, well below the state average.

Martin County Schools participates in the community eligibility program and provides district-wide breakfast and lunch to all Pre-K to 12th grade students in our schools at no cost to the students.

Economic barriers have taken their toll on the county. As of March 2015, the unemployment rate in Martin County was 6.9%. The per capita personal income for 2013 was $33,365 compared to $38,683 for the state. The weekly wage for Martin County was 67% of North Carolina's with Martin County at $566 and North Carolina at $839 (http://esesc23.esc.state.nc.us/workforceindepth/).

Student Data

Generally, Martin County Schools attendance is around 94-95%. In 2011-12, the district attendance rate was about 93%. The two high schools had the highest attendance rates of all the schools in the district and the middle schools had the lowest. While the high schools continue to have very high attendance rates, the other schools have increased their attendance rates up to around 94 or 95% with some fluctuations between months. Currently, for 2015-16 we are at 95% overall. Only two schools are below 95% (both at 94%) for the 2nd month.

Overall, the number of Out-of-School Suspensions have decreased in the county. However, black males amass more OSS days than any other subgroup, and one school accounts for a disproportionate number of these suspensions. In 2013-14, there were 1,190 incidents resulting in 3,768 days of OSS. The distribution of OSS days by race is 78% Black, 11% white, and 11% Other. Black males accounted for 49.8% of OSS days, and Black females accounted for 28.1% of OSS days in 2013-14.

In 2014-2015, there was a total of 1,114 incidents representing a 6% decrease from the previous year, resulting in 3,317 OSS days which was a decrease of 17%. Although, the total number of incidents and days decreased, the percentage of days attributed to Black makes increased to 57.1%, but the percent of days attributed to Black females decreased to 24.9%. Riverside Middle School accounted for 288 incidents for 1,181.5 days in 2014-15. This was an improvement over the previous year during which RMS accounted for 406 incidents and 1,566 days of OSS, but there is additional work to be done. One reason for the decline has been steps taken to implement PBIS in all the district's schools. The high schools and middle schools have now added the program. The district has also employed three individuals to work directly with at-risk youth. One of those individuals works full-time at Riverside Middle School.

The past three years of student retention data indicates a system-wide percentage of between 6% and 9%. Schools with the greatest percentage of retentions in 2014-15 include Riverside Middle (approx. 12.8%), Riverside High (approx. 10.8%), and South Creek High (approx. 13.6%). The district has implemented efforts to either reduce or catch up retained students including the introduction of transition classes in upper grades similar to the way the ¾ transition classes operate, a drop-back in academy for previous drop-outs and students that need an alternative course of study to catch them up, an accelerator program for 8th grade students much older than their peers, and a ninth grade academy to alleviate 9th grade transition issues including retentions. What is unknown at this point is whether or not the 10-point grading scale will have an effect on lowering these numbers.

The dropout rate for Martin County has also decline over the past several years. In 2006-2007 and 2007-2008, Martin County had 85 and 84 students to drop out, respectively. These numbers equaled a dropout rate of 4.33 and 4.44. However, since 2008, the county has cut the dropout rate in half. By the year 2012-2013, there were only 37 dropouts (a rate of 2.47) and in 2013-2014 there were 32 dropouts, a rate of 2.19. While the 2014-15 data is not yet official, indications are that the rate fell a bit more.

Unfortunately, the decreasing dropout rate has not led to a major increase in the graduation rate. Between 2011-2012 and 2013-2014, the district's 4-year cohort graduation rate increased each year from 74.3% to 76.3% to 77.4%. In 2014-15, the 4-year cohort graduation rate took a disappointing dive down to 75.4%. This is doubly disappointing because the dropout rate has continued to fall. The failure of our high schools to meet or exceed the 80% mark is likely due to one or two courses that consistently trip up students. Early data analysis indicates Math II is one cause along with the 9th grade transition. Through the 9th grade academy and more analysis of student progress in Math II along with proactive remediation and quick credit recover, it is hoped the graduation rate will increase.

Overall, many schools are in good shape regarding attendance, discipline, and retentions. However, there are problems to be solved in some schools that most likely impact their students' performance and growth. These factors are addressed in Goal 1.

Assessment Data

The analysis of the data for Martin County schools revealed two major issues that must be addressed by the district improvement plan: testing proficiency and student growth.

Growth

Growth

When viewing the EVAAS growth data for grades 3 through 8, we see that as a district our 4th grade math growth has been significantly below expected levels for the past three years. Additionally, 7th grade growth in math has been significantly below expected levels for two of the past three years with the overall three year average being below expected levels. Only in 6th and 8th grade math has the district, as a whole exceeded growth expectations on a consistent and substantive basis.

To view this issue deeper, an analysis of the 4th grade math in terms of subgroups reveals the following: In 2015, our Black population subgroup only met growth in one of the EVAAS quintiles, that being the Lowest grouping. In that case, growth was met via standard error with a -1.0. All other quintiles were substantially below growth expectations by as much as a -10. Our White population subgroup reflected a somewhat similar pattern. Within this subgroup the, as with the black subgroup, the lowest quintile showed growth along with the highest quintile showed growth. The growth scores, however, were not as dramatically below the State growth median and the lowest quintile actually exceeded the growth median in 2015 by +10.9 and the highest quintile met growth. When viewing the pattern over the past three years, both the black and white subgroups were the same in the fact that neither group met or exceeded growth. The white subgroup's EVAAS growth scores, however, were somewhat closer to meeting growth than were those of their black counterparts. It should be noted that our other subgroups such as Hispanic, Multiracial, and Asian etc. are so small that their results are statically insignificant in terms of overall impact on the district's growth patterns.

To look at this grade level in more depth, we view our two primary subgroups in terms of both race and gender. In this analysis, we see that on a consistent basis our Black males and females in 2015 showed growth only in the lowest EVAAS quintile. In both instances, that growth was met via standard error and was reflected in a negative growth score. In addition, in both subgroups there were only six students in total that were even classified in the mid-high or highest quintile. For the three-year period average, neither the black male nor black female subgroups met or exceeded growth. As for the district's white male subgroup, the lowest quintile exceeded growth while the mid-low and highest quintile met growth via standard error. Of the two subgroups meeting growth, both were via standard error and had a negative growth score. In terms of a three-year average, none of this subgroup met or exceeded growth expectations. White females exceeded growth in the lowest quintile and the low mid and mid high quintiles met growth via standard error albeit with a negative growth score. There were no white females in the 4th grade math highest quintile in 2015. As with the previously discussed subgroups, in terms of the 3-year average, white females did not meet or exceed growth in any quintile.

When looking at the performance quintile grouping percentage of Black students, we see that in 2015 81.8% of this subgroup was found in the lowest and mid-low quintile. This trend is reflected in the three-year average where we find 75.1% of the Black subgroup is found in the lowest and mid-low quintile. When looking that this same grouping in the White subgroup, we see in 2015 48% of this subgroup were in the lowest and mid-low quintile and for the three-year average only 38% of the subgroup were designated lowest and mid-low. This significant discrepancy must be addressed at both the district and school level regardless of the overall racial demographic of the school or district.

Finally, when viewing the SWD subgroup in 4th grade math, we see in 2015 that the lowest quintile actually met growth expectation and met it with a positive score of +2.8. 87.7% of students with disabilities were in this quintile in 2015 thereby yielding statistically insignificant results in the other quintiles. When viewing SWD students over a three-year average, we see no quintile meeting or exceeding growth expectations and, in this period, 84.9% of the students are designated in low or mid-low quintiles.

Turning to our 7th grade math for an in-depth analysis, we see the following issues. In 2015 none of the Black subgroup, quintiles met or exceeded growth expectations. Growth indicators ranged from -6.7 t-4.0. Contrasting that, in the three-year average, quintiles lowest, mid-low and mid-high met growth expectations with mid-low actually exceeding the state growth average by 0.6. Quintiles high and middle did not meet growth expectations. 68.5% of black students are found in the low and mid-low quintiles in 2015 and for the three-year average, 68.1% of the black subgroup is in the low and mid-low quintiles. In the White subgroup, none of the quintiles met or exceeded growth. No quintiles met growth expectations. The quintile with the lowest growth indicator was the highest quintile showing a -14.6 growth score placing our supposedly highest achieving students significantly below the state growth average for that quintile. This would indicate that these students are not even close to where students with like testing histories in the state are performing

quintile. This would indicate that these students are not even close to where students with like testing histories in the state are performing.

When drilling down to gender specific subgroups, we see for 2015 Black males met growth expectations in the lowest and middle quintiles while those students in the mid-low quintile did not meet growth expectations. There were only four black males in the mid-high and none in the highest quintiles. This lack of numbers creates an insignificant measure in this metric. The Black female subgroup did not meet growth expectations in any quintile in 2015. In the three-year average, however, we see the low and highest quintiles meeting growth and the mid-low quintile exceeding growth for this period. Comparatively, the White male subgroup did not meet growth expectations in any quintile in 2015 and only in the lowest quintile in the three-year average with a score of +0.8. White females had only enough students in the middle and mid-high quintiles to provide growth data in 2015. In both cases, the growth expectations were not met. This is a stark contrast to the three-year average wherein all quintiles with the exception of the highest quintile met growth. In each quintile in the three-year period, the growth expectations were met via standard error of measure with a negative growth factor. As with the 4th grade, there are too few students within other subgroups to provide statistically significant data in terms of growth.

Finally, when viewing the SWD subgroup in 7th grade math we see that in 2015, the lowest quintile did meet growth expectation via standard error and the mid-low did not meet expectations. In 2015, 95.8% of the SWD were in the lowest and low-mid quintile. For the three-year average, only the low-mid quintile did not meet expectations. Low, middle and mid-high quintiles met growth expectations with the lowest quintile showing a positive growth of +2.0.

In the five instances where our district met growth over this three-year collection period, the growth that was observed was still below the state's expected growth standard in four of these instances and achieved the "met growth" status only through the standard error of measure. Finally, when viewing the district average NCE scores in comparison to the State average of 50, at no point on any grade level did the district average meet or exceed the State average. Martin County fell below the State math average by 6 to 14 points over the three-year period.

When viewing the EVAAS growth data for grade 3 through 8 reading over the past three years, one sees a similar situation, albeit not as clearly consistent and defined, in terms of specific grade levels meeting, exceeding or failing to meet growth. District-wide, grades 3 and 5 are generally failing to meet expected growth levels on a consistent basis, grades 4 and 6 are either meeting or exceeding growth consistently and grade 7 has shown a three-year downward trend from exceeding growth to not meeting growth. In this period, we see that in 2015 the Black subgroup met expectations in the lowest, mid-high and highest quintiles while the other two quintiles did not meet. For the three-year average, this same subgroup met only in the middle quintile. In 2015, the White subgroup met growth in the lowest and highest quintiles with no other quintile meeting expectations and over the three-year average only the low mid quintile met expectations.

In 2015 Black male subgroup, met expectations in all quintiles except low-mid and over the three-year average did not meet in any quintile. Subgroup Black female met in lowest, mid-high and high and did not meet in mid-low and middle. For the three-year average, this subgroup met only in the middle quintile. Subgroup white male met in quintiles lowest, middle and highest in 2015 with all growth indicators being positive scores. For the three-year average, only quintiles mid-low and middle met and that was via standard error with all negative scores. Subgroup white female met growth expectations in 2015 in quintiles lowest, mid-high and highest and had positive scores in the mid-high and highest quintiles. For the three-year average, this subgroup met expectations in lowest, low-mid and highest. Only in the low-mid quintile was a growth indicator shown.

It should also be noted that in SY 2015 only grades 4 and 6 met EVAAS growth expectations in reading, all other grade levels failed to meet the standard and none exceeded the growth expectation standard. In these two grades, almost all subgroups met or exceed growth expectations and generally met with a positive metric. Additionally, when viewing the district NCE average score, once again the district did not reach the state average of 50. The discrepancy, however, was less than that in math with closest score being 2.8 below the state average and the greatest being 7.9 below the state average score.

After reviewing the district data, the team looked at the individual 3 – 8 school's growth performance data and noted the following:

MATH

- *EJ Hayes – Consistently does not meet growth standard 4th & 5th Grades*
- *Edna Andrews – Consistently meets growth expectations but growth scores are below the NC Growth standard and are met via Standard Error.*
- *East End – Consistently meets standard, with 2014 exceeding, and growth scores are mostly above State Standard*

• East End – Consistently meets standard, with 2014 exceeding, and growth scores are mostly above State Standard

• Jamesville Elementary – 4th Grade consistently does not meet growth expectations. 5th Grade meets expectations with most growth scores above State Standard

• Rodgers – 4th Grade has moved over 3 years from does not meet to exceeds growth. 5th Grade consistently does not meet growth expectation

• Riverside Middle – 6th and 8th grades consistently exceed growth expectations. 7th grade consistently does not meet expectations by a large margin.

READING

• EJ Hayes – Consistently meets or exceeds growth expectations but in the cases of where the growth is met, the majority of the scores are below the state standard thereby indicating the expectation is met via Standard Error of Measurement.

• Edna Andrews – In all 3 years the school has met growth expectations but the growth was met via Standard Error of Measurement as is noted by the negative growth scores.

• East End – 3rd Grade has not met growth expectation in the two measured years, 4th grade consistently meets with positive numbers and 5th grade has met 2 of three years and one year did not meet. The growth numbers, however, were all below the state standard.

• Jamesville – 3rd Grade has never met growth expectations. 4th and 5th grade have met but the majority of scores were met via standard error of measurement.

• Rodgers – The majority of growth standards were met, with the exception of the 2014 3rd grade but the majority of the standards were met via standard error of measurement.

• Riverside Middle – 2013 and 2014 standards were met or exceeded and those meeting were done with positive numbers. In 2015, however, 6th met via standard error of measurement and 7th and 8th did not meet at all.

Individual schools have been provided growth data in terms of subgroup analysis.

School Plan for Improvement

District Name:		LEA Code:	Year:
Martin County Schools		580	2015-2016
District Goal #1: (SMART - Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Time-Bound)	***Each school will use data to drive teaching and learning, cultivate a positive, productive school culture, and leverage resources to improve student outcomes as evidenced by 7 point gains in proficiency and 9 point gains in EVAAS growth.***		
	SBE Goal Alignment:	Goal 1: Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education and citizenship.	
	LEA Goal Alignment:	Goal 1: Every student in Martin County Schools will graduate from high school prepared for work, further education, and citizenship.	
	Indistar Indicator: (if applicable)	C13 - The principal focuses on building leadership capacity, achieving learning goals, and improving instruction. (1712)	
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	Has Begun	
District Goal #2: (SMART - Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Time-Bound)	***Each school will demonstrate an annual seven (7) percentage point increase in proficiency for reading, mathematics, and science over the next three years.***		
	SBE Goal Alignment:	Goal 1: Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education and citizenship.	
	LEA Goal Alignment:	Goal 1: Every student in Martin County Schools will graduate from high school prepared for work, further education, and citizenship.	
	Indistar Indicator: (if applicable)	H01 - The principal ensures that teachers align instruction with standards and benchmarks. (1714)	
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	Has Begun	
District Goal #3: (SMART - Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Time-Bound)	***Each school will increase their EVAAS growth score by an average of 9 points each year over the next three years.***		
	SBE Goal Alignment:	Goal 2: Every student has a personalized education.	
	LEA Goal Alignment:	Goal 2: Every student has a personalized education.	
	Indistar Indicator: (if applicable)	I03 - All teachers, working in teams, differentiate and align learning activities with state standards. (1716)	
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	Has Begun	

School Plan for Improvement

District Name:	LEA Code:	Year:
Martin County Schools	580	2015-2016

District Goal #1:	***Each school will use data to drive teaching and learning, cultivate a positive, productive school culture, and leverage resources to improve student outcomes as evidenced by 7 point gains in proficiency and 9 point gains in EVAAS growth.***			
Strategy #1: Describe the strategy that will support this goal	***The school with district assistance will instill a data-driven decision process and analyze and disaggregate multiple data sources to chart and monitor improvement.***			
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	Has Begun		
Tasks/Action Steps: Describe the action steps that will be taken to support this strategy.	***(1) Administer benchmark assessments on a 9-12 week basis and analyze results with regards to standards mastery and goal summary deficits. (2) Multiple data sources are used to make intervention decisions. (3) Teachers participate in PLCs to monitor student growth and standards mastery. (4) Data on teacher effectiveness and student performance is used to target professional development and expenditures on resources and programs. (5) Work with the central office to hold professional development sessions on how to interpret and plan using various student data. (6) The Director of Accountability will develop for each school proficiency and growth trends and targets for the next three years.***			
	Evidence: (Identify documents and artifacts)	CASE benchmark data, EVAAS performance and effectiveness data, goal summary alignment, intervention plans, schedules and rosters, purchase orders, professional development forms, reading 3D charts, iReady data, PLC agendas, notes, and rosters, monitoring template on which teachers enter standards, proficiency results, and growth data, proficiency and growth targets		
	Person(s) Responsible:	Teachers and principals conduct data comparisons and identify needs, Director of Accountability to provide proficiency and growth targets, student data, and assist with data analysis, Title I Director assists with purchase alignment, District Instructional Coaches and Directors conduct and/or arrange professional development		
	Timeline:	Benchmark testing every 9-12 weeks, professional development as delivered by instructional coaches or outside vendors has already begun, intervention groups have been formed and intervention activities are ongoing, 3-year targets completed, principal data		
	Budget Amount: (if applicable)	$100,000.00	Budget Source: (if applicable)	Title I, small schools funds, low wealth funds
Strategy #2: Describe the strategy that will support this goal	***The school will cultivate a positive culture and create productive learning and working conditions.***			
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	Has Begun		

Tasks/Action Steps: Describe the action steps that will be taken to support this strategy.	***(1) The principal will, in collaboration with teachers and/or the community, develop ways to celebrate school successes in raising student achievement and growth. (2) The principal will reflect on prior and future Teacher Working Conditions Survey results for ways to improve the school's working conditions and look for ways to improve school morale. (3) The principal and all school employees will engage in positive relationships with students, parents, and the community. (4) The principal and staff will seek to more completely understand their students including their individual strengths and challenges as well as students' learning styles. (5) The principal will develop a sense of shared ownership for student achievement, school improvement, and performance setbacks. (6) Minimize staff and student absences and student disciplinary consequences to reduce time away from school and learning environment. (7) The Director of Accountability, who has led a high school successfully through the school turnaround process, will lead principals in efforts to improve their schools.***			
	Evidence: (Identify documents and artifacts)	TWCS reflections and action steps to improve low areas, celebration plans, records including rosters, agendas, pictures, videos, posters, etc. of parent and community engagement activities, documentation examples indicating greater student understanding such as data walls, student profiles including each students' learning style, staff and student attendance trends, student suspension trends, records indicating principal participation (and others as necessary) in district and school improvement meetings and training sessions, district staff walk-through reports		
	Person(s) Responsible:	Principal and staff are responsible for shared ownership of school improvements or setbacks, Principal reflects on TWCS and makes plans accordingly, Principal and Personnel Director addresses high staff absences, Principal and staff along with the Director of Student Services addresses high student absences and/or suspensions, Principal and staff develop community involvement activities that go beyond just communication, Central Office staff will investigate methods to identify student learning styles, Director of Accountability will work with principals on turnaround programs, the Superintendent and the central office staff perform school walk-throughs at least montly.		
	Timeline:	Community involvement programs at least quarterly, Principal monitors attendance monthly and meets with Personnel Director if problem arises, principal and staff monitors and meets on students' attendance and discipline each 6 weeks. Celebration for student improvement each 3-6 weeks. Principal turnaround programs at least monthly, school walkthroughs at least monthly		
	Budget Amount: (if applicable)	$1,500.00	Budget Source: (if applicable)	Title I for parent programs
Strategy #3: Describe the strategy that will support this goal	***The principal will align and leverage the school's resources towards the improvement of student performance and growth.***			
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	Partially Implemented		

Tasks/Action Steps: Describe the action steps that will be taken to support this strategy.	***(1) Analyze student standards mastery data and goal summaries to determine whether professional development on particular standards and/or skills is necessary. (2) Collaboration between the school and central office staff to provide appropriate professional development programs and ensure that the right teachers attend and implement the training. (3) Use Title I and other instructional funding to provide resources necessary to enhance the teaching and/or intervention of standards/skills on which the school has previously scored poorly.***			
	Evidence: (Identify documents and artifacts)	Purchase Orders, Title I purchase order request forms, professional development logs, SD-1 forms, Professional development plans indicating relevant instructional deficiencies		
	Person(s) Responsible:	Principal and school improvement or leadership team determines which areas and which staff require professional development, Principal, Title I Director, and the Superintendent are responsible for aligning expenses, District Instructional coaches and Central Office Directors provide some professional development, Principal responsible for school-sponsored professional development		
	Timeline:	Principal analyzes data and determines areas for professional development by November 30, 2015. Title I request forms in use, Title I director meetings with principals quarterly, instructional coaches assisting with professional development as requested by principal. Principals will submit professional development logs and reports to superintendent as part of the principal evaluation process.		
	Budget Amount: (if applicable)	Varies	Budget Source: (if applicable)	

School Plan for Improvement

District Name:	LEA Code:	Year:
Martin County Schools	580	2015-2016

District Goal #2:	***Each school will demonstrate an annual seven (7) percentage point increase in proficiency for reading, mathematics, and science over the next three years.***			
Strategy #1: Describe the strategy that will support this goal	***The school will ensure that the North Carolina Standard Course of Study is explicitly taught in preparation for EOG and EOC testing.***			
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	Has Begun		
Tasks/Action Steps: Describe the action steps that will be taken to support this strategy.	***(1) Re-examine unpacking documents to update pacing guides to reflect appropriate pacing and assessment. (2) All core teachers will utilize SchoolNet resources and assessment items and identify Standard Course of Study objectives on assessments. (3) Teachers and administrators will, in PLCs, examine goal summaries and create a plan to improve achievement in content areas with previously low performance.***			
	Evidence: (Identify documents and artifacts)	Revised Pacing Guides, SchoolNet Usage, Goal Summary Plans, Assessments Indicating Standards Objectives.		
	Person(s) Responsible:	Principals will make sure teachers and students have access to SchoolNet, monitor SchoolNet use, and conduct PLCs to create plans to address goal summary data. Teachers will use SchoolNet resources, particularly assessment items, and will actively participate in PLCs on goal summaries. Central Office Directors and District Instructional Coaches will provide additional training on School Net and assist teachers in its use when necessary.		
	Timeline:	Rewriting of pacing guides has started and will continue through the fall of 2015, SchoolNet use ongoing throughout 2015-16 and through the following two years, goal summary reviews by December 15, 2015 of this year and by September 30 in subsequent years. Training on SchoolNet will occur on October 26th.		
	Budget Amount: (if applicable)	N/A	Budget Source: (if applicable)	
Strategy #2: Describe the strategy that will support this goal	***The school will initiate steps towards standards-based grading and reporting.***			
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	Has Begun		
	(1) Each teacher's lesson plans will explicitly reflect how assignments, assessments, and grades reflect content mastery. (2) Teachers will communicate to parents standards mastery and reading level (as appropriate) in addition to letter/numerical grades. (3) District administration will recommend that the Board of Education adopt standards-based grading policies.			

Tasks/Action Steps: Describe the action steps that will be taken to support this strategy.	Evidence: (Identify documents and artifacts)	Lesson Plans will be checked bi-weekly; Standards mastery progress reports every three weeks; reading level will be measured using AR,		
	Person(s) Responsible:	Teachers will prepare lesson plans that reflect standards mastery and communicate mastery to parents. Principals will monitor lesson plans. District Instructional Coaches and Central Office Directors will assist teachers in understanding how to check for mastery and will develop a form teachers can use to communicate mastery and reading level. Superintendent will work with the Board of Education on policy adoption.		
	Timeline:	Lesson Plans will be checked bi-weekly; Standards-mastery progress reports every three weeks. Standards mastery progress reporting will begin in November 2015.		
	Budget Amount: (if applicable)	N/A	Budget Source: (if applicable)	
Strategy #3: Describe the strategy that will support this goal	***Each low performing school will develop a plan for content remediation and intervention.***			
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	Has Begun		
Tasks/Action Steps: Describe the action steps that will be taken to support this strategy.	***(1) Teachers will regularly report to administrators the status of their classes with respect to content standards mastery. (2) Teachers will compare classroom and benchmark test data to standards mastery and develop plans to reteach/remediate students not achieving mastery. (3) Teachers will keep running records of students mastery on standards throughout the school term and set goals for moving all students to mastery by test time. Records shall be used in such a manner to allow students to monitor their own learning and set personal learning goals for standards mastery but not jeopardize students' dignity.***			
	Evidence: (Identify documents and artifacts)	Classroom mastery status reported to principals every 3 weeks beginning in November 2015, Reteaching/Remediation Plans are to be reflected in lesson plans beginning November 2015 if not already present , Running Records of Student Mastery begin November 2015.		
	Person(s) Responsible:	Teachers will create and report to principals mastery status of their classes, make sure their lesson plans reflect plans to reteach and remediate, and maintain a running record of how their class achieves total standards mastery in preparation for the EOGs/EOCs. Principals will study classroom status reports and look for classrooms or areas in which large numbers of students are "stuck" or behind, address those concerns with the teacher(s) and develop plans for them to solve the problem. Central Office Directors and District Instructional Coaches will provide assistance to teachers and principals in the development of the running record or remediation plans.		

	Timeline:	Reteaching/Remediation plans included in lesson plans will begin by November 1, if not already being done. Mastery reports to principals will coincide with master progress reporting in November 2015. Running Records will begin in December 2015.		
	Budget Amount: (if applicable)	$27,000	Budget Source: (if applicable)	Title I

School Plan for Improvement

District Name:	School Code:	Year:
Martin County Schools	580	2015-2016

District Goal #3:	***Each school will increase their EVAAS growth score by an average of 9 points each year over the next three years.***
Strategy #1: Describe the strategy that will support this District Goal	***Each school will develop an effective school-wide differentiated intervention program to improve academic growth and skills for struggling learners, average or moderately struggling learners, or high-performing learners.***

Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	Has Begun		
Tasks/Action Steps: Describe the action steps that will be taken to support this strategy.	***(1) Use diagnostic tools (including but not limited to BOG, Portfolios, Reading 3D, Accelerated Reader, CASE Benchmarks, EVAAS, iReady, ST Math, Lexile and Quantile Levels) to determine skills gaps and areas where performance may be improved for struggling, moderately struggling or average, and high-performing learners. (2) Ensure teachers shown to be effective with each specific group of learners (using EVAAS data) are matched with those same groups of students, when possible, to maximize gains. (3) Determine which intervention resources are most effective with each group of learners (iReady, AR, Reading 3D, Quantiles, etc.) (4) Closely monitor for both fidelity and student growth. (5) Create and monitor PEPs for struggling learners. (6) Create incentives to encourage students to continue participation in intervention/growth sessions.***			
	Evidence: (Identify documents and artifacts)	Intervention Plan and Schedule, Monitoring/Evaluation Records Student Assessment Data, PEPs,		
	Person(s) Responsible:	Principals and teachers use diagnostic tools to determine which students have significant skills deficits, moderate skill deficits, or who tend to score high but are not growing as they should and create appropriate differentiated intervention groups. Principals use effectiveness data to determine which teachers work best with each quintile of students. District Instructional Coaches and curriculum directors help principals identify and access resources most likely to work with all groups of learners. Intervention teachers, monitor student improvement at least every two weeks. Teachers, principals, and parents prepare PEPs on struggling learners. PEPS are managed as a component of intervention. The principal sends a PEP report to the Superintendent by the end of October, and the principal monitors the intervention process on a 2-week basis.		
	Timeline:	PEPs have been created, intervention groups are currently being assembled based on EVAAS and other data, progress and fidelity monitored at least every 2 weeks.		
	Budget Amount: (if applicable)	N/A	Budget Source: (if applicable)	

Strategy #2: Describe the strategy that will support this goal	***Teachers will implement classroom intervention programs that use small group instruction to address specific skills students are lacking.***			
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	Has Begun		
Tasks/Action Steps: Describe the action steps that will be taken to support this strategy.	***(1) Using classroom assessments and diagnostic tools, teachers determine which foundational skills students lack or are weak. (2) Teachers create a plan through which they provide intervention to fill in gaps. (3) Utilize available classroom resources/techniques such as small group instruction, Study Island, iReady, Accelerated Reader, EdSphere, etc. to facilitate intervention. (4) Participate in professional development activities related to intervention such as Reading Foundations and Math Foundations. (5) Monitor how classroom intervention assists students with standards mastery by keeping a log of student progress. (6) Create incentives to encourage students to continue participation in intervention/growth sessions.***			
	Evidence: (Identify documents and artifacts)	Classroom intervention plans, schedules, and monitored results. Professional development rosters, student progress logs		
	Person(s) Responsible:	Teacher is responsible for diagnosing skills gaps, creating an intervention plan, utilizing available resources, participating in PD, if necessary, and maintaining a progress log. Principal is responsible for monitoring classroom intervention plans and logs and providing, with assistance from the district, resources for intervention. District Instructional Coaches are responsible for modeling small group practices and helping teachers with monitoring component. All District Staff is responsible for providing resources and professional development, as needed.		
	Timeline:	Professional development offered in fall and spring. Classroom intervention has begun and is ongoing throughout the year. Intervention logs are completed every 3 weeks.		
	Budget Amount: (if applicable)	Varies by school	Budget Source: (if applicable)	Title I, Title II, district PD funds, RLIS
Strategy #3: Describe the strategy that will support this goal				
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:			
	Evidence: (Identify documents and artifacts)			

Tasks/Action Steps: Describe the action steps that will be taken to support this strategy.	Person(s) Responsible:			
	Timeline:			
	Budget Amount: (if applicable)		Budget Source: (if applicable)	

Martin County Board of Education Policies Recommended for Change To Improve School Performance Grades and Growth Points
The district leadership recommends that the Board of Education adopt a policy that moves Martin County Schools in the direction of Standards-Based Grading and Reporting for grades K-8. We believe this move will provide more accurate data as to students' mastery of essential content and more clearly demonstrate whether or not students meet minimum competencies to be successful in subsequent grade levels.