

School District of Indian River County

# Gifford Middle School



## 2019-20 School Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>26</b>

# Gifford Middle School

4530 28TH CT, Vero Beach, FL 32967

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Tosha Jones**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	61%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	<p>Black/African American Students</p> <p>Economically Disadvantaged Students</p> <p>English Language Learners</p> <p>Hispanic Students</p> <p>Multiracial Students</p> <p>Students With Disabilities</p> <p>White Students</p>
<b>School Grade</b>	2018-19: B
<b>School Grades History</b>	<p>2017-18: B</p> <p>2016-17: C</p> <p>2015-16: C</p> <p>2014-15: B</p> <p>2013-14: C</p>
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

Gifford Middle School will improve student achievement by providing rigor, relevance and relationships to prepare our students for college and careers.

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

Students of Gifford Middle School will know that they are valued and cared about so they may learn in a supportive environment and succeed as 21st Century learners.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jones, Tosha	Principal	Tosha Jones, Principal, is responsible for creating and maintaining the culture of the school. She collaborates with school based leaders to develop and implement professional development and to provide instructional support.
Heppern , Felice	Assistant Principal	Felice Heppern, Assistant Principal, is responsible for support the culture of the school. She collaborates with school based leaders to develop and implement professional development, behavioral interventions, PBIS, and instructional support.
Szpaichler, Jeremy	Assistant Principal	Jeremy Szpaichler, Assistant Principal, is responsible for support the culture of the school. He collaborates with school based leaders to develop and implement professional development, monitors the fidelity of academic/behavioral interventions, monitors school-wide academic/behavioral data, MTSS, and provides instructional coaching.
Peterson, Connie	Guidance Counselor	7th/8th Grade Guidance Counselor and MTSS Team Member
Verne-Saint-Louis, Saphir	Guidance Counselor	6th/7th Grade Guidance Counselor and MTSS Team Member
Eberhardt, Eric	Other	Behavioral Interventionist, PBIS Coordinator, and MTSS Team Member
Demeter, Nancy	Teacher, K-12	Nancy Demeter, Math Department Chair, is responsible for working with individual teachers to examine available data from district, state and classroom assessments to identify areas of remediation and extension. She models best practices and proven strategies that enhance and support instruction and student achievement.
Hand, Sherrilynn	Teacher, K-12	Sherrilynn Hand, English Department Chair, will be responsible for working with Felice Heppern, Reading Department Chair, and ELA teachers in supporting the literacy plan and to cultivate collaborative planning in which role-alike teams will examine available data from district, state and classroom assessments to identify areas of remediation and extension.
Ridlen, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Susan Ridlen, Reading Department Chair, will be responsible for working with Felice Heppern, reading teachers, and the ELA Department Chair to develop and implement a school-wide literacy plan. She is also responsible for tier 2 and 3 interventions which focus on student literacy.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Browning, Carlean	Teacher, K-12	Carlean Browning, Science Department Chair, is responsible for working with individual teachers to examine science data from district, state, and classroom assessments to identify areas of remediation and extension. She will model best practices, 1:1 initiatives, and proven strategies to enhance and support instruction within the Science Department.
Tomlinson, Paul	Teacher, K-12	Paul Tomlinson, Social Studies Department Chair, will provide support for all social studies teachers in collaborative planning, best instructional practices, and standards-based data driven instruction that focuses on school, district, and state assessments.
Houseknecht, Amy	Teacher, K-12	6th Grade Level Chair, is responsible for working with grade level teachers on monitoring behavioral, academic, and attendance data. With this data the grade level team will target areas of need and implement research-based interventions to positively impact the data points.
Phelps, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	Joseph Phelps, 7th Grade Level Chair, is responsible for working with grade level teachers on monitoring behavioral, academic, and attendance data. With this data the grade level team will target areas of need and implement research-based interventions to positively impact the data points.
Schwenger, John	Teacher, K-12	John Schwenger, 8th Grade Level Chair, is responsible for working with grade level teachers on monitoring behavioral, academic, and attendance data. With this data the grade level team will target areas of need and implement research-based interventions to positively impact the data points.

**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	210	240	196	0	0	0	0	646
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	43	44	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	26	27	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	68	27	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	89	58	0	0	0	0	206

**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	16	70	42	0	0	0	0	128

**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	4	1	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

Tuesday 8/27/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	55	57	0	0	0	0	156
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	25	30	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	47	53	0	0	0	0	117
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	60	75	0	0	0	0	219

**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	36	50	63	0	0	0	0	149

## 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	52%	54%	54%	57%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	55%	54%	56%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	42%	47%	39%	39%	47%
Math Achievement	54%	60%	58%	62%	59%	58%
Math Learning Gains	50%	59%	57%	67%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	50%	51%	55%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	53%	51%	64%	57%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	69%	72%	72%	68%	68%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	210 (0)	240 (0)	196 (0)	646 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	20 ( )	43 ( )	44 ( )	107 (0)
One or more suspensions	12 (0)	26 (0)	27 (0)	65 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 (0)	68 (0)	27 (0)	98 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	59 (0)	89 (0)	58 (0)	206 (0)

### Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	47%	52%	-5%	54%	-7%
	2018	50%	48%	2%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	55%	51%	4%	52%	3%
	2018	48%	44%	4%	51%	-3%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	55%	53%	2%	56%	-1%
	2018	66%	55%	11%	58%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	50%	53%	-3%	55%	-5%
	2018	56%	51%	5%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	41%	53%	-12%	54%	-13%
	2018	47%	52%	-5%	54%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
08	2019	30%	47%	-17%	46%	-16%
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	45%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	46%	49%	-3%	48%	-2%
	2018	62%	53%	9%	50%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
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	67%	69%	-2%	71%	-4%
2018	65%	65%	0%	71%	-6%
Compare		2%			

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	95%	58%	37%	61%	34%
2018	97%	61%	36%	62%	35%
Compare		-2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	53%	41%	57%	37%
2018	100%	50%	50%	56%	44%
Compare		-6%			

**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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	38	33	27	36	27	28	36	50		
ELL	36	53	53	51	60	60		60			
BLK	28	46	40	30	38	31	15	45	58		
HSP	53	57	59	50	50	42	38	76	75		
MUL	72	76		42	37						
WHT	69	60	43	74	59	44	75	81	81		
FRL	37	50	45	36	43	33	28	57	57		

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	22	34	28	33	53	49	29	35			
ELL	18	43	38	26	52	70					
BLK	28	41	36	36	58	49	34	46	43		
HSP	55	55	40	58	67	65	60	53	65		
MUL	76	64		69	73		91		91		
WHT	73	65	41	78	71	55	78	89	85		
FRL	38	46	38	44	59	53	45	53	51		

**ESSA Data**

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	52
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	31
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	515
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
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
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57

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	65
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	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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 school grade components recorded as the lowest performing for the 18-19 school year are Math LQLG (36%), ELA LQLG (44%), and Science Achievement (48%). GMS’s Math LQLG fell 19% from 55% in 17-18 to 36% in 18-19. The following factors have been identified as impeding academic progress for Math LQLG: Sixth Grade Mathematics Achievement for students enrolled in Math 1 was 21% compared to 88% for students enrolled in Math 1 Adv., Seventh Grade Mathematics Cohort fell 15% with respect to achievement between the 17-18 and 18-19, Student Achievement for Pre-Algebra on the Math FSA fell 16% between 17-18 and 18-19, and 11.4% of Lvl. 1 and Lvl. 2 students earned a Level 3 or higher on the Math FSA in 18-19. GMS’s ELA LQLG increased by 5% from 39% in 17-18 to 44% in 18-19. The following factors have been identified as

impeding academic progress for ELA LQLG: Sixth Grade LQ averaged 29% for Key Ideas and Details and 26% for Integration of Knowledge and Ideas on the 18-19 FSA ELA, Seventh Grade LQ averaged 29% for Key Ideas and Details on the 18-19 FSA ELA, and Eighth Grade LQ averaged 33% for Key Ideas and Details on the 18-19 FSA ELA. GMS's Science Achievement fell 16% from 64% in 17-18 to 48% in 18-19. The following factors have been identified as contributing to low student achievement in Science Achievement: Curricular transition/standard alignment of newly adopted materials and targeted common unit assessment problem-solving.

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

The school grade components exhibiting the greatest declines from 17-18 to 18-19 are Math Learning Gains, Math LQLG, and Science Achievement. Math Learning Gains fell 17% from 67% in 17-18 to 50% in 18-19. The following factors have been identified as contributing to a decline in academic growth with respect to Math Learning Gains: A 17% decrease in academic growth for SWD's from 53% in 17-18 to 36% in 18-19, a 17% decrease in academic growth for Hispanic students from 67% in 17-18 to 50% in 18-19, and a 20% decrease in academic growth for Black/AA students from 58% in 17-18 to 38% in 18-19. Math LQLG fell 19% from 55% in 17-18 to 36% in 18-19. The following factors have been identified as contributing to a decline in academic growth with respect to Math LQLG: A 22% decrease in academic growth for SWD's from 49% in 17-18 to 27% in 18-19, a 23% decrease in academic growth for Hispanic students from 65% in 17-18 to 42% in 18-19, and a 18% decrease in academic growth for Black/AA students from 49% in 17-18 to 31% in 18-19. Science Achievement fell 16% from 64% in 17-18 to 48% in 18-19. The following factors have been identified as contributing to low student achievement in Science Achievement: a 22% decrease in academic achievement for Hispanic students from 60% in 17-18 to 38% in 18-19, and a 19% decrease in academic achievement for Black/AA students from 34% in 17-18 to 15% in 18-19.

**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 school grade components exhibiting the greatest gaps when compared to the state average are ELA LQLG, 6th ELA Achievement, Math Learning Gains, Math LQLG, and 7th/8th Grade Math Achievement. A -3% gap in academic growth is evident for ELA LQLG (44%) when compared to the state (47%). A -7% gap in academic achievement is evident for 6th ELA Achievement (47%) when compared to the state (54%). A -7% gap in academic growth is evident for Math LG (50%) when compared to the state (57%). A -15% gap in academic growth is evident for Math LQLG (36%) when compared to the state (51%). A -13% gap in academic achievement is evident for 7th Math Achievement (41%) when compared to the state (54%). A -16% gap in academic achievement is evident for 8th Math Achievement (30%) when compared to the state (46%).

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

The school grade components exhibiting the greatest growth from the 17-18 to the 18-19 school year are Civics Achievement, 7th/8th Grade ELA Achievement, ELA LQLG, and ELL Achievement/Academic Growth. Civics Achievement increased by 2% from 65% in 17-18 to 67% in 18-19. The following action-steps/initiatives contributed to an increase in achievement on the Civics EOC: Department Role-Alike Collaborative Planning, Monthly Department Role-Alike Data Chats, Common Unit Assessments, Targeted Research-Based Problem-Solving of Common Unit Assessment Data, and EOC Boot Camp. 7th Grade ELA

Achievement increased by 7% from 48% in 17-18 to 55% in 18-19, contributing to a 5% achievement gain for the 7th Grade cohort. The 8th Grade cohort increased achievement on the ELA FSA by 7% from 48% in 17-18 to 55% in 18-19. ELA LQLG increased by 5% from 39% in 17-18 to 44% in 18-19. The following factors have been identified as contributing to an increase in 7th/8th achievement and LQLG: a 5%/17% increase in Craft and Structure, a 12%/11% increase in Integration of Knowledge and Ideas, a 4%/2% increase in Key Ideas and Details, a 6% increase for 8th Grade Language and Editing, Targeted Research Based Problem-Solving of Common Unit Assessment Data, Level 1 students for Intensive Reading, and 'Stop and Write' initiative. ELL students increased ELA Achievement by 18%, ELA LG by 10%, ELA LGLQ by 15%, Math Achievement by 25% and LG by 8%. The following factors have been identified as contributing to an increase in achievement and growth for ELL: Push-In/Pull-Out support.

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

A reflection on the EWS data lead to the identification of students with an attendance rate less than 90% and students who earned a Level 1 on the ELA or Math FSA in the 18-19 school year. 28% of the current 6th grade students, 37.1% of the current 7th grade students, and 29.6% of the current 8th grade students exhibit the EWS of earning a Level 1 on the ELA or Math FSA in the 18-19 school year. Furthermore, 49.6% of the current Black/AA sub-group and 62.1% of the current SWD sub-group exhibit this early warning indicator. 9.5% of the current 6th grade students, 17.9% of the current 7th grade students, and 22.4% of the current 8th grade students exhibit the EWS of less than a 90% attendance rate in the 18-19 school year. Additionally, 17.4% of the current Black/AA sub-group and 18% of the current SWD sub-group exhibit this early warning indicator.

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

1. Mathematics Achievement / Mathematics Learning Gains / Mathematics Lower Quartile Learning Gains
2. SWD and Black/AA Mathematics Learning Gains / Mathematics Lower Quartile Learning Gains
3. ELA LQLG
4. Science Achievement
5. Attendance Rate

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

### **Areas of Focus:**



**#1****Title**

Mathematics Learning Gains and Lower Quartile Learning Gains

**Rationale**

Math Learning Gains fell 17% from 67% in 17-18 to 50% in 18-19. A 17% decrease in academic growth is evident for SWD's from 53% in 17-18 to 36% in 18-19. A 20% decrease in academic growth for Black/AA students from 58% in 17-18 to 38% in 18-19. Math LQLG fell 19% from 55% in 17-18 to 36% in 18-19. A 22% decrease in academic growth for SWD's from 49% in 17-18 to 27% in 18-19. A 18% decrease in academic growth for Black/AA students from 49% in 17-18 to 31% in 18-19.

**State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve**

Mathematics Learning Gains will measure at or above 65% for students whose assessment validates academic growth from the previous year. Mathematics Lower Quartile Learning Gains will measure at or above 55% for students in the lower quartile whose assessment validates academic growth from the previous year. Math Learning Gains for SWD will measure at or above 50%. Math Learning Gains for Black/AA students will measure at or above 55%. Math Lower Quartile Learning Gains for SWD's will measure at or above 50%. Math Lower Quartile Learning Gains for Black/AA students will measure at or above 50%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy**

For teachers to ensure an increase in student achievement and academic growth, they must be aware and plan for the individuals who are in their classrooms. Teachers must demonstrate cultural literacy and knowledge of learning modalities to create student-focused curriculums. Disaggregated data must be considered across student sub-groups for teachers to effectively individualize and differentiate instruction to promote student success.

The work of Cortes, Goodman, and Nomi (2013) found evidence of positive impacts from intensive math instruction for low-performing and at-risk students (p. 7). Gersten et al. (2009) found that students who struggle with mathematics can prevent subsequent failures when targeted early intervention math courses (p. 23). As a precautionary intervention, LQ students who are in our targeted ESSA sub-groups were enrolled in Intensive Math or Learning Strategies to support academic growth in mathematics throughout year.

**References:**

Cortes, K., Goodman, J., & Nomi, T. (2013). A double dose of algebra: Intensive math instruction has long-term benefits. *Education Next*, 13(1), 70-76.

Gersten, R., Beckmann, S., Clarke, B., Foegen, A., Marsh, L., & Star, J. R. (2009). *Assisting students struggling with mathematics: Response to intervention for elementary and middle schools*. Washington, D.C.: Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.



**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy**

The research of Fuchs and Fuchs (1986) states that providing teachers with graphical representations of student performance scores on formative assessments is associated with a 26 percentile point gain in achievement (Effects of Systematic Formative Evaluation: A Meta-Analysis). A 32 percentile point gain in student achievement is evident when students track their own progress (Marzano, 2006). Learning gains achieved by students for their performance on statewide mathematics FSA/EOC represent two components that contribute to the generation of a school grade in Florida (Florida Department of Education, 2016). Therefore, the achievement gaps for the Math FSA/EOC will be targeted.

References:

Florida Department of Education. (2016). 2016 Preliminary School Grades Overview. Tallahassee, Florida: Florida Department of Education.

Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (1986). Effects of Systematic Formative Evaluation: A Meta-Analysis. *Exceptional Children*, 53(3), 199-208.

Marzano, R. J. (2006). *Classroom Assessment and Grading that Works*. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.

**Action Step**

1. Provide equitable access to opportunities across the mathematics curriculums and instructional frameworks.
2. Implementation of I-Ready Math with fidelity.
3. Schedule LQ students in Intensive Math or Learning Strategies:
  - a. 67 students who are in the current year Lower Quartile for math are enrolled in Intensive Math.
    - i. 57% of those students are identified as Black/African-American (ESSA).
    - ii. 12% are identified as SWD (ESSA).
  - b. 87% of students identified as SWD and who are in the current year Lower Quartile for math have been enrolled in Learning Strategies (ESSA).
    - i. 22% of the students are also identified as Black/African-American (ESSA).

**Description**

4. Utilize S.P.L.A.S.H. for remediation and intervention. Students will be pulled for individualized targeted support to increase academic growth on the FSA.
5. SDIRC District Specialists from the Curriculum and Instruction Department will provide on-going tiered support and instructional coaching for mathematics teachers to strengthen mathematics instruction and problem-solving.
6. Foster and monitor effective and productive weekly department collaborative planning to deepen teacher knowledge and strengthen capacity to create and deliver a rigorous and relevant standards-based curriculum aligned to MAFS, FSA/EOC Assessment Blueprints, DOK, and Test Item Specifications through backwards design.
7. Disaggregate student data by sub-group and academic standard to drive instruction, target academic intervention, refer individual students to the

MTSS/RTI-A teams for targeted problem-solving, and identify needs for further support.

- a. ESSA sub-group data will be shared and reflected upon for each SDIRC Unit Assessment.
- b. Department Chair will monitor LQ data from SDIRC Unit Assessments and I-Ready.
- c. Department Chair will facilitate collaborative planning and data chats for role-alike teachers while adhering to the GMS Problem-Solving Process.

8. Teachers and students will become partners in classroom data monitoring to track learning gains and promote achievement.

9. The GMS MTSS team will monitor the fidelity and effectiveness of implemented academic interventions for all students. Weekly, the MTSS team will monitor the efficacy of implemented academic interventions for SWD and Black/African-American students in the LQ for the Math FSA.

**Person  
Responsible**

Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)

---

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	ELA Lower Quartile Learning Gains
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>ELA LQLG increased by 5% from 39% in 17-18 to 44% in 18-19. However, ELA LQLG was the third lowest school grade component recorded in the 2018-2019 school year. The Sixth Grade LQ averaged 29% for 'Key Ideas and Details' and 26% for 'Integration of Knowledge and Ideas' on the 18-19 FSA. The data reflects a 17.15% and 10.36% gap when compared to the state averages for the respective Sixth Grade ELA FSA Reporting Categories. The Seventh Grade LQ averaged 29% for 'Key Ideas and Details' on the 18-19 FSA ELA. The data reflects a 21% gap when compared to the state average for the respective Seventh Grade ELA FSA Reporting Category. The Eighth Grade LQ averaged 33% for 'Key Ideas and Details' on the 18-19 FSA ELA. The data reflects a 20% gap when compared to the state average for the respective Eighth Grade ELA FSA Reporting Category.</p>

<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<p>ELA Lower Quartile Learning Gains will measure at or above 50% for students whose assessment validates academic growth from the previous year.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	<p>Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)</p>
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>The National Council of Teachers of English (2007) found that “students who struggle with reading a physics text may be excellent readers of poetry, the students who has difficulty with word problems in math may be very comfortable with historical narratives” (p. 2). Student literacies are largely invisible in all classrooms (National Council of Teachers of English, 2007). Teachers must make intentional efforts in the uncovering of students lack of proficiency in reading and writing to best meet the needs of all students and increase student achievement. For teachers to ensure an increase in academic growth, they must be aware and plan for the individuals who are in their classrooms. Teachers must demonstrate cultural literacy and knowledge of learning modalities to create student-focused curriculums. Disaggregated data must be considered across student sub-groups for teachers to effectively individualize and differentiate instruction to promote student success.</p> <p>References:</p> <p>National Council of Teachers of English. (2007). Adolescent literacy. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.</p> <p>The research of Fuchs and Fuchs (1986) states that providing teachers with graphical representations of student performance scores on formative assessments is associated with a 26 percentile point gain in achievement (Effects of Systematic Formative Evaluation: A Meta-Analysis). A 32 percentile point gain in student achievement is evident when students track their own progress (Marzano, 2006). Learning gains achieved by students for their performance on statewide ELA FSA represent two components that</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>The research of Fuchs and Fuchs (1986) states that providing teachers with graphical representations of student performance scores on formative assessments is associated with a 26 percentile point gain in achievement (Effects of Systematic Formative Evaluation: A Meta-Analysis). A 32 percentile point gain in student achievement is evident when students track their own progress (Marzano, 2006). Learning gains achieved by students for their performance on statewide ELA FSA represent two components that</p>

contribute to the generation of a school grade in Florida (Florida Department of Education, 2016). Therefore, the achievement gaps for the ELA FSA will be targeted.

References:

Florida Department of Education. (2016). 2016 Preliminary School Grades Overview. Tallahassee, Florida: Florida Department of Education.

Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (1986). Effects of Systematic Formative Evaluation: A Meta-Analysis. *Exceptional Children*, 53(3), 199-208.

Marzano, R. J. (2006). *Classroom Assessment and Grading that Works*. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.

Action Step

1. Provide equitable access to opportunities across the ELA curriculums and instructional frameworks.
2. Implementation of I-Ready Reading with fidelity.
3. Schedule Low-Level 1 ELA LQ students in Double-Block Intensive Reading:
  - a. 53% of students who are in the current year Lower Quartile for ELA are enrolled in Double-Block Intensive Reading.
    - i. 56% of the students are identified as Black/African-American (ESSA).
    - ii. 46% are identified as SWD (ESSA).
4. Schedule High Level 1 and Level 2 ELA LQ students in Single-Block Intensive Reading:
  - a. 65% of students who are in the current year Lower Quartile for ELA are enrolled in Single-Block Intensive Reading.
    - i. 64% of the students are identified as Black/African-American (ESSA).
    - ii. 37% are identified as SWD (ESSA).

Description

5. Schedule ELA LQ students in Learning Strategies:
  - a. 54% of students who are in the current year Lower Quartile for ELA are enrolled in Learning Strategies.
    - i. 73% of the students are identified as Black/African-American (ESSA).
    - ii. 100% of the students are identified as SWD (ESSA).
6. Utilize S.P.L.A.S.H. for remediation and intervention. Students will be pulled for individualized targeted support to increase academic growth on the FSA.
7. SDIRC District Specialists from the Curriculum and Instruction Department will provide on-going tiered support and instructional coaching for ELA and Reading teachers to improve student achievement in the FSA Reporting Categories of Key Ideas and Details and Integration of Knowledge and Ideas.
8. Foster and monitor effective and productive weekly department collaborative planning to deepen teacher knowledge and strengthen capacity to create and deliver a rigorous and relevant standards-based curriculum aligned to LAFS, FSA Assessment Blueprints, DOK, and Test Item Specifications through backwards design.

9. Disaggregate student data by sub-group and academic standard to drive instruction, target academic intervention, refer individual students to the MTSS/RTI-A teams for targeted problem-solving, and identify needs for further support.
  - a. ESSA sub-group data will be shared and reflected upon for each SDIRC Unit Assessment.
  - b. Department Chair will monitor LQ data from SDIRC Unit Assessments and I-Ready.
  - c. Department Chair will facilitate collaborative planning and data chats for role-alike teachers while adhering to the GMS Problem-Solving Process.
10. Teachers and students will become partners in classroom data monitoring to track learning gains and promote achievement.
11. The GMS MTSS team will monitor the fidelity and effectiveness of implemented academic interventions for all students. Weekly, the MTSS team will monitor the efficacy of implemented academic interventions for SWD and Black/African-American students in the LQ for the ELA FSA.
12. Two dates will be scheduled for the school-wide 'Stop and Write' initiative. Students will be given a writing prompt that mimics the ELA FSA Writing Test for their appropriate grade level. The classroom environment will be tailored to the expectations of an FSA Testing Environment. Student work will be graded via the FSA Writing Rubric. Student sub-groups will be pulled for remediation and intervention to positively impact student writing scores.

**Person  
Responsible**

Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)

---

<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Science Achievement
<b>Rationale</b>	Science Achievement fell 16% from 64% in 17-18 to 48% in 18-19. A 22% decrease in academic achievement was evident for Hispanic students from 60% in 17-18 to 38% in 18-19. A 19% decrease in academic achievement was evident for Black/AA students from 34% in 17-18 to 15% in 18-19. A 1% decrease in academic achievement was evident for SWD from 29% in 17-18 to 28% in 18-19.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Science Achievement will measure at or above 60%. Science Achievement for Black/AA students will measure at or above 40% (ESSA). Science Achievement for SWD's will measure at or above 40% (ESSA).
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>8th Grade Science teachers will collaborate weekly using the Florida Standards/End-of-Course Assessment Blueprint(s) and the Florida Standards/End-of-Course Assessment Item Specifications fluidly to identify student misunderstandings, plan curriculums, create and analyze standard-based assessments, plan for research-based interventions, and unwrap state curricular standards. Throughout the assessment cycle, the science department will track disaggregated student data, and use this data to create action plans to increase student achievement for standards in which students lack proficiency.</p> <p>The research of Fuchs and Fuchs (1986) states that providing teachers with graphical representations of student performance scores on formative assessments is associated with a 26 percentile point gain in achievement (Effects of Systematic Formative Evaluation: A Meta-Analysis). A 32 percentile point gain in student achievement is evident when students track their own progress (Marzano, 2006). Science Achievement on statewide 8th Grade Science EOC represents one component that contributes to the generation of a school grade in Florida (Florida Department of Education, 2016). Therefore, school initiatives will focus on increasing 8th Grade Science Achievement.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>References:</p> <p>Florida Department of Education. (2016). 2016 Preliminary School Grades Overview. Tallahassee, Florida: Florida Department of Education.</p> <p>Fuchs, L. S., &amp; Fuchs, D. (1986). Effects of Systematic Formative Evaluation: A Meta-Analysis. <i>Exceptional Children</i>, 53(3), 199-208.</p> <p>Marzano, R. J. (2006). <i>Classroom Assessment and Grading that Works</i>. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.</p>
<b>Action Step</b>	

1. Provide equitable access to opportunities across the mathematics curriculums and instructional frameworks.
2. Schedule Support Facilitators to increase the capacity and intensify efforts to support SWD who are enrolled in 8th Grade Science.
3. Utilize S.P.L.A.S.H. for remediation and intervention. Students will be pulled for individualized targeted support to increase academic growth on the FSA.
5. SDIRC District Specialists from the Curriculum and Instruction Department will provide on-going tiered support and instructional coaching for science teachers to strengthen science instruction and problem-solving.
6. Foster and monitor effective and productive weekly department collaborative planning to deepen teacher knowledge and strengthen capacity to create and deliver a rigorous and relevant standards-based curriculum aligned to NGSSS, FSA/EOC Assessment Blueprints, DOK, and Test Item Specifications through backwards design.
7. Disaggregate student data by sub-group and academic standard to drive instruction, target academic intervention, refer individual students to the MTSS/RTI-A teams for targeted problem-solving, and identify needs for further support.
  - a. ESSA sub-group data will be shared and reflected upon for each SDIRC Unit Assessment.
  - b. Department Chair will monitor LQ data from SDIRC Unit Assessments.
  - c. Department Chair will facilitate collaborative planning and data chats for role-alike teachers while adhering to the GMS Problem-Solving Process.
8. Teachers and students will become partners in classroom data monitoring to track learning gains and promote achievement.
9. The GMS MTSS team will monitor the fidelity and effectiveness of implemented academic interventions for all students. Weekly, the MTSS team will monitor the efficacy of implemented academic interventions for SWD and Black/African-American students in 8th Grade Science.

**Description**

**Person Responsible**

Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)

---



<b>#4</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Student Attendance
<b>Rationale</b>	9.5% of the current 6th grade students, 17.9% of the current 7th grade students, and 22.4% of the current 8th grade students exhibit the EWS of less than a 90% attendance rate in the 18-19 school year. Additionally, 17.4% of the current Black/AA sub-group and 18% of the current SWD sub-group exhibit this early warning indicator.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Decrease the percent of students whose attendance rate is less than 90% from 16.5% to 8%. Decrease the percent of Black/AA students whose attendance rate is less than 90% from 17.4% to 8%. Decrease the percent of SWD students whose attendance rate is less than 90% from 18% to 8%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>Eighth grade assessment scores are accurate predictors of a student achievement for the ninth grade school year (Allensworth &amp; Easton, 2007). However, attendance rate is eight times greater of a predictor for course failure than eighth grade test scores for students in their freshman year (Allensworth &amp; Easton, 2007). Allensworth and Easton (2007) examined sub-groups of incoming ninth-graders who were in the lower-quartile. They found that students in the sub-group who were absent for less than five days in a semester earned fewer failing grades than students in the upper-quartile who are absent greater than nine days per semester (Allensworth &amp; Easton, 2007).</p> <p>References:</p> <p>Allensworth, E. M., &amp; Easton, J. Q. (2007). What matters for staying on-track and graduating in Chicago public high schools: A close look at course grades, failures, and attendance in the freshman year. Chicago, IL: Consortium on Chicago School Research at The University of Chicago.</p> <p>Research conducted by Neild and Balfanz (2006) categorized ninth grade students as 'at-risk of not graduating' if their attendance is less than 70%, earn fewer than two credits, and are not promoted to the tenth grade (Unfulfilled Promise: The Dimensions and Characteristics of Philadelphia's Dropout Crisis, 2000-2005, p. 36). A study of Chicago Public Schools by Allensworth (2005) classifies students as 'not on track for graduation' if they meet at least two of the following risk factors: attendance, GPA, credits, and grades (Graduation and Dropout Trends in Chicago: A Look at Cohorts of Students from 1991 through 2004, p. 64).</p> <p>References:</p> <p>Allensworth, E. (2005). Graduation and Dropout Trends in Chicago: A Look at Cohorts of Students from 1991 through 2004. Chicago, Illinois: Consortium on Chicago School Research.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	



Neild, R. C., & Balfanz, R. (2006). *Unfulfilled Promise: The Dimensions and Characteristics of Philadelphia's Dropout Crisis, 2000-2005*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Philadelphia Youth Network.

**Action Step**

1. Grade-Level Chairs will monitor respective students whose attendance rate is less than 90%. Grade-Level Teams, with the support of administration and the guidance counselors, will create action-plans to promote student attendance and problem-solve barriers for individual students.
2. Grade-Level Chairs will monitor the fidelity of generated action-plans. School administration will meet monthly with the Grade-Level chairs to review data and refocus initiatives.

**Description**

3. Those students who have been identified as not responding to action-plans/interventions will be referred to the school-based MTSS team. In collaboration with the SDIRC Student Services Attendance Team, targeted interventions will be developed, monitored, and action-steps taken to promote individual student attendance.
4. School-Wide acknowledgements and celebrations will occur monthly to promote school-wide attendance.

**Person Responsible**

Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)**

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

School improvement is a framework for quality improvement through the disciplined and continuous use of evidence-based quantitative and qualitative methods aimed to improve the effectiveness, efficiency, equity, relevance, and fidelity of implemented researched best practices to reduce the gap between a school’s current level of performance and its actual potential – culminating to an increase in achievement for all students. To attain the overarching goal of increasing student achievement, school administrators must create problem-solving networks that focus on curriculum delivery, student achievement, school environment, and parent involvement.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is an evidence-based model that calls on data-based problem solving processes and research to create action plans to promote academic and behavioral success. The GMS MTSS Team and Leadership Team will drive school-wide initiatives to meet and surpass school improvement goals to ensure student achievement continually increases. Within this forum, school-based leaders articulate, advocate, and enact a shared vision and mission to cultivate core values of a high-quality education, academic success, and well-being for all students.

The GMS Problem-Solving Flow Chart weaves the work of the Response-to-Intervention: Academic Team and Response-to-Intervention: Behavior Team through the structure of MTSS, curricular departments, and grade-level teams. Response-to-Intervention, a component of Florida’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports, “involves the systematic use of assessment data to inform instructional decisions and efficiently allocate resources to improve learning for all students” (Florida Department of Education, 2008). It allows the opportunity to identify, through data mining, those students who would benefit from the

implementation of researched based practices to obtain academic mastery. Many factors affect student performance - RTI is the avenue to identify barriers behaviorally and academically hindering on student success.

<b>Part V: Budget</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Mathematics Learning Gains and Lower Quartile Learning Gains</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ELA Lower Quartile Learning Gains</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Science Achievement</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Student Attendance</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$0.00</b>