Gifford Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Gifford Middle School

4530 28TH CT, Vero Beach, FL 32967

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Chadwick Bacon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	62%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org.](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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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. Ms. Jones collaborates with school based leaders to develop and implement professional development and to provide instructional support.
Blidgen, Tisa	Assistant Principal	Tisa Blidgen, Assistant Principal, is responsible for support the culture of the school. Mrs. Blidgen 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. Mr. Szpaichler 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
Morgan, Quentin	Other	To assist the principal in developing interventions which will support students academically and behaviorally creating and maintaining a safe and secure environment which is conducive to learning. PBIS Coordinator and MTSS Team Member.
Schwenger, John	Instructional Coach	John Schwenger is the Math Instructional Coach and Math Department Chair.
Hand, Sherrilynn	Teacher, K-12	Sherrilynn Hand, English Department Chair, will be responsible for working with Tisa Blidgen, 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	Instructional Coach	Susan Ridlen is the Reading Instructional Coach and Reading Department Chair
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.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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.
Greenwood, Daniel	Teacher, K-12	Daniel Greenwoord, 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Chadwick Bacon

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

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
25

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
48

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	62%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	220	242	204	0	0	0	0	666
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	36	36	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	23	17	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	59	37	0	0	0	0	172
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	73	12	0	0	0	0	130
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	65	43	0	0	0	0	142
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	61	45	0	0	0	0	155

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	190	186	141	0	0	0	0	517

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	8	9	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	3	0	0	0	0	14

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/21/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

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%	52%	51%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	55%	54%	50%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	42%	47%	36%	37%	44%
Math Achievement	54%	60%	58%	54%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	50%	59%	57%	51%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	50%	51%	37%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	48%	53%	51%	46%	50%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	69%	72%	72%	70%	71%	70%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey			
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	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%
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%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	38	33	27	36	27	28	36	50		
ELL	36	53	53	51	60	60		60			

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	10	31	37	9	27	31	9	19			
ELL	15	33	31	20	32	31					
BLK	17	27	28	22	37	34	13	50	64		
HSP	51	54	33	44	50	45	37	75	67		
MUL	71	61		55	50		40	100			
WHT	70	60	50	74	59	40	66	76	79		
FRL	30	37	30	30	39	33	24	53	54		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	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%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
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

English Language Learners	
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

Asian Students	
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

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
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.

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?

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 and/or Math FSA in the 18-19 school year. 24% of the current 6th grade students, 27% of the current 7th grade students, and 31% of the current 8th grade students exhibit the EWS of earning a Level 1 on the ELA and/or Math FSA in the 18-19 school year. Furthermore, 45% of the current Black/AA sub-group and 56% of the current SWD sub-group exhibit this early warning indicator. 11% of the current 6th grade students, 13% of the current 7th grade students, and 12% of the current 8th grade students exhibit the EWS of less than a 90% attendance rate in the 19-20 school year. Additionally, 15% of the current Black/ AA sub-group and 14% 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. ESSA Sub-Group African-American Achievement
2. ESSA Sub-Group SWD Achievement
3. Need for Instructional Coaching in ELA/Reading/Math

4. Staff Misconception between Student Compliance and Student Engagment
5. Equity and Diveristy

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 2018-2019 Federal Index Report defined that Students with Disbailites (33%) and Black/African-American (37%) students at Gifford Middle School were below the targeted 41% Federal Index. Gifford Middle School has indentified the following to have contributed to the ESSA outcomes for Students with Disabilities and Black/African-American students: Mathematics Learning Gains, Mathematics Lower Quartile Learning Gains, ELA Achievement, and Science Achievement. Mathematics Learning Gains for all students fell 17% from the 17-18 school year to the 18-19 school year. A 17% decrease in academic growth for Students with Disabilities and a 20% decrease in academic growth for Black/African-American students was evident between the 17-18 and 18-19 Mathematics FSA/Algebra 1 EOC/Geometry EOC Assessments. Mathematics Lower Quartile Learning Gains fell 19% from the 17-18 to the 18-19 school year for all students. A 22% decrease in academic growth for Students with Disabilities and a 18% decrease in academic growth for Black/African-American students was evident between the 17-18 and 18-19 Mathematics FSA/Algebra 1 EOC/Geometry EOC Assessments. A 5% decrease in ELA Achievement for all students was evident from the 17-18 to the 18-19 ELA FSA. A 1% decrese in student achievement for Students with Disabilities and a 0% increase in student achievment for Black/African-American students was evident between the 17-18 and the 18-19 ELA FSA. Science Achievement for all students fell 16%from the 17-18 school year to the 18-19 school year. A 1% decrease in acadmic achievement for Students with Disabilities and a 19% decrease in academic achievement for Black/African-American Students was evident between the 17-18 and the 18-19 Science NGSSS EOC Assesments.
Measurable Outcome:	Mathematics Learning Gains will measure at or above 65% for students whose assessment validates academic growth from 18-19. Mathematics LQ Learning Gains will measure at or above 55% for students in the LQ whose assessment validates academic growth from 18-19. Mathematics Learning Gains for SWD will measure at or above 50% (ESSA). Mathematics Learning Gains for Black/AA students will measure at or above 55% (ESSA). Mathematics LQ Learning Gains for SWD's will measure at or above 50% (ESSA). Mathematics LQ Learning Gains for Black/AA students will measure at or above 50% (ESSA). ELA LQ Learning Gains will measure at or above 50% for students whose assessment validates academic growth from 18-19. 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).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase school capacities to effectively engage all stakeholders through a fluid and continuous Tier II MTSS Data-Driven Problem-Solving Process to monitor progress,

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	impliment/adjust intervention, and positively impact academic achievement for Students with Disabilites and Black/African-American Students. Multi-Tiered System of Supports is an evidence-based model that integrates Response to Intervention and Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports into a continuum of structured school-wide problem-solving teams that leverage evidence-based instruction/intervention through the continuous systematic use of student achievement and behavioral data (Higgins & Rinaldi, 2011;IDEA, 2004). 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 (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2015).

Action Steps to Implement

Targeted students will be enrolled in Learning Strategies for the 20-21 school year. The course will enable students with disabilities to acquire and generalize strategies and skills across academic and community settings to achieve annual goals based on assessed needs and the student's individual educational plan (IEP). The course will address academic skill deficits enabling students to learn strategies to access the general curriculum and close educational gaps.

52% percent of the enrolled students are in the 20-21 Math LQ. 56% percent of enrolled students are in the 20-21 ELA LQ. 52% of enrolled students are African-American. 76% of SWD students that have selected the 'Traditional' instructional model for the 20-21 school year are enrolled in the course Learning Strategies.

Person Responsible   Connie Peterson (connie.peterson@indianriverschools.org)

Students who are identified within the ELA LQ will be enrolled in Intensive Reading courses. The purpose of this course is to provide instruction that enables students to accelerate and strengthen the development of reading skills to successfully read middle grade level text independently. Instruction emphasizes reading comprehension, writing fluency, and vocabulary study through the use of a variety of literary and informational texts encompassing a broad range of text structures, genres, and levels of complexity.

100% of ELA LQ students that have selected the 'Traditional' instructional model for the 20-21 school year are enrolled in an Intentisive Reading course - 34% of which are enrolled in Double Block Intensive Reading. Of the students enrolled in Double Block Intensive Reaing: 50% are Students with Disabilities and 71% are Black/African-American.

27% of students enrolled in Intensive Reading are Students with Disabilities and 41% of students are Black/African-American.

Person Responsible   Connie Peterson (connie.peterson@indianriverschools.org)

Support Facilitators are scheduled to increase the capacity and intensify of school efforts to support SWD who are enrolled in 8th Grade Science and 7th Grade Civics - in addition to ELA and Math courses.

Person Responsible   Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)

The GMS MTSS team will monitor the fidelity and effectiveness of implemented academic interventions for all students. Weekly, the MTSS team will monitor the effect of implemented academic interventions for SWD and Black/African-American students.

Person Responsible   Jeremy Szpaichler (jeremy.szpaichler@indianriverschools.org)

Increase capactiy for role-alike curricular teams to collect, analyze, and disaggregate district unit common assessment data to drive instruction and plan for interventions that targeted unmastered standards and

student sub-group misconceptions. Role-Alike teams will collaboratively work through the GMS Problem-Solving Worksheet at the conclusion of each unit assessment to identify targeted standards for intervention and plan for the remediation of student sub-group misconceptions.

Person Responsible Jeremy Szpaichler (jeremy.szpaichler@indianriverschools.org)

Grade-Level teams will collect, analyze, and disaggregate attendance, failure, and discipline sub-group data to drive grade-level Tier I and Tier II problem-solving and plan for intervention. Grade Level teams will complete the GMS Grade-Level Problem-Solving Worksheet at the conclusion of each month and plan for behavioral intervention.

Person Responsible Tisa Blidgen (tisa.blidgen@indianriverschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	School leaders must influence learning by galvanizing efforts around targeted school goals to establish a culture that supports teachers in the preparation of all students for personal success through a strategically designed rigorous curriculum in a caring supportive environment. Gifford Middle School has identified factors in which collaborative planning, data-analysis, professional development, and instructional coaching will have a high impact on student achievement. School-based instructional coaching is key to improving instruction, which is the critical lever for increasing student achievement (Saphier & West, 2009).
Measurable Outcome:	20-21 ELA FSA Achievement willl measure at or above 57%. 20-21 Mathematics FSA/Alg I EOC/Geometry EOC Achievement willl measure at or above 62%. Evidence of a 20% increase in Standard-Based Instruction from Instructional Round/Impact Review Data. Evidence of a 20% increase in achievement on SDIRC Unit Assessment Data for SWD/Black/African-American when compared to 19-20 (ESSA).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement the evidence-based intervention of instructional coaching for classroom teachers - allowing for the modeling of ethical decision-making skills surrounding equitable considerations and data to impact teaching and learning leading to an increase in student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has shown that high quality professional development is sustained, relevant, actively engaging, standards-based, and focused on practice (U.S. Department of Education, 1999). "Instructional coaching seeks to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development for teachers in order to improve teacher practices and student learning" (Iowa Area Education Agencies, 2015). Research suggests when teachers and administrators are supported by ongoing professional development there is an increase in student achievement (Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001). Teachers must have support to adopt new initiatives, explore a plethora of pedagogical models, and impliment research-based instructional strategies as part of their daily practice.

Action Steps to Implement

The Reading and Mathematics Instructional Coach will meet weekly with administration to discuss achievement data, walkthrough data, the collaborative planning process, coaches agenda, targeted school initiatives, and instructional concerns.

Person Responsible	Jeremy Szpaichler (jeremy.szpaichler@indianriverschools.org)

The Reading Instructional Coach will facilitate weekly professional collaborative support/planning for ELA/Reading teachers to strengthen teacher capacity to implement standard-based instruction aligned to LAFS, FSA Assessment Blueprints, DOK, and Test Item Specifications that is intentionally designed to scaffold pedagogical strategies ensuring all students are authentically engaged through rigorous and equitable learning experiences leading to increased student achievement and autonomy.

Person Responsible	Susan Ridlen (susan.ridlen@indianriverschools.org)

The Math Instructional Coach will facilitate weekly professional collaborative support/planning for math teachers to strengthen teacher capacity to implement standard-based instruction aligned to MAFS, FSA/EOC Assessment Blueprints, DOK, and Test Item Specifications that is intentionally designed to scaffold

pedagogical strategies ensuring all students are authentically engaged through rigorous and equitable learning experiences leading to increased student achievement and autonomy.

Person Responsible John Schwenger (john.schwenger@indianriverschools.org)

Survey staff members to target instructional needs of classroom teachers and create schoolwide professional development opportunities to improve classroom instruction.

Person Responsible Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)

Monthly data chat reviews with school leadership specific to ESSA supbgroup initiatives student achievement, and classroom/instructional support.

Person Responsible Jeremy Szpaichler (jeremy.szpaichler@indianriverschools.org)

Provide school-based professional development to increase teacher capactiy for effective planning and implementation of Standard-Based DQ3 and DQ4 lessons.

Person Responsible Tisa Blidgen (tisa.blidgen@indianriverschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The rebranding of Gifford Middle School to a STEAM school with a focus on Marine Science and Robotics. Students will have opportunties to be actively engaged in curriculums that utilize innovative technologies to enhance science-based conservative action leading to the protection and restoration of aquatic ecosystems.
Measurable Outcome:	20-21 Mathematics FSA/Algebra I EOC/Geometry EOC LQ Learning Gains willl measure at or above 55%. 20-21 ELA FSA LQ Learning Gains willl measure at or above 50%. 20-21 Science EOC Achievement willl measure at or above 64%. Evidence of a 20% increase in Active Student Engagement from Instructional Round/ Impact Review Data. Evidence of a 15% increase in After-School Learning Opportunity attendance from 19-20.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Integrate STEAM initiatives across curriculums and increase opportunities for after-school learning experiences tied to STEAM initiatives.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Women, persons with disabilities, and three racial/ethnic groups—blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians - are underrepresented in science and engineering (National Science Foundation, 2013). Researchers has identified STEM education produces positive outcomes for a diverse range of students (Nasir & Lee, 2011). The integration of STEM integration has a positive impact on middle school student achievement (Han et al., 2016; McCaslin, 2015; Tolliver, 2016). When extending learning into afterschool programs, significant effects on student achievement have been found among students at-risk of failure in reading or math (Lauer, Akiba, Wilkerson, & Martin-Glenn, 2006). Integrating multiple disciplines across curriculums and learning experieces students have the opportunity to make sense of the world in an authentic way (Basham, Israel, & Maynard, 2010).

Action Steps to Implement

Offer Marine Science and Robotics courses within the master schedule for students in the 2020-2021 school year.

Person Responsible	Connie Peterson (connie.peterson@indianriverschools.org)

Provide school-based professional development to increase teacher capacity to plan for and implement standard-based instruction, aligned to STEAM initiatives, that is intentionally designed to scaffold pedagogical strategies ensuring all students are authentically engaged through equitable rigorous learning experiences leading to increased student achievement and autonomy.

Person Responsible	Tisa Blidgen (tisa.blidgen@indianriverschools.org)

Research has found that low-income middle school students who regularly attended quality after-school programs demonstrated a 12-percentile increase in standardized math test scores relative to their peers who did not attend (Mahoney & Cairns, 1997).

Lagoon Guardians is an after-school/weekend educational program aimed to empower and engage

students in scientific research, citizen science, and scientific literacy - allowing students the opportunity to participate in practical and realistic research experiences surrounding the Indian River Lagoon.

The Youth Sailing Foundation of Indian River County Squadron Program teaches students to sail while enjoying the beautiful Indian River Lagoon. The program is taught by professional sailing instructors and utilizes elements of the US Sailing STEM Education Initiative curriculum.

The Ocean American and Conservation Association providces opportunities for students to work side-by-side with ORCA scientists in the feild and labs to conduct real world science.

Person Responsible   Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Provide an equitable and respectful educational experience for every student, family, and staff member - regardless of race, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, ability, home or first language, religion, national origin, or age.
Measurable Outcome:	Evidence of a 10% decrease in ODR data from 19-20. Evidence of a 10% decrease in ODR data for SWD and Black/African-American students from 19-20. Evidence of a 30% decrease in OSS data from 19-20. Evidence of a 30% decrease in OSS data for SWD and Black/African-American students from 19-20. Evidence of a 10% decrease in course failure from 19-20. Evidence of a 25% decrease in course failure for SWD and Black/African-American students from 19-20. Maintain/Increase faculty population of 31% Black/African-American from 20-21 to 21-22. Qualitative Data collected from Staff/Student/Parent Surveys
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide welcoming, safe and equitable learning environments with a commitment to cultivating a culture that reflects, respects and embraces the voices, perspectives and differences arising from our diverse community by eliminating educational inequities and providing equitable access to services, school resources, and other learning opportunities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Ninety percent of U.S. public school teachers are white; most grew up and attended school in middle-class, English-speaking, predominantly white communities and received their teacher preparation in predominantly white colleges and universities (Gay, Dingus, & Jackson, 2003). Educators have not acquired the experiential and education background that would prepare them for the growing diversity of their students (Ladson-Billings, 2002; Vavrus, 2002). While White students also benefit by learning from teachers of color, the impact is significant on acadmic achievement, attendence rate, and graduation rate for students of color when served by teachers of color leading to an attachment to school and learning (Carver-Thomas, 2018).

Action Steps to Implement

Support and guide classroom teachers to ensure students have equitable access to opportunities across the all curriculums, instructional frameworks, and learning environments.

Person Responsible	Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)

The GMS African-American Student Council intiative will provide GMS students opportunities to identify, create, and/or participate in school/ community improvement projects. Members of the GMS African-American Student Coucil will gather and monitor feedback to profoundly postively impact support for Gifford Middle School and the Vero Beach/Gifford communities.

Person Responsible	Connie Peterson (connie.peterson@indianriverschools.org)

Crossover Mission, Inc., a non-profit organization whose purpose is to support and redirect at-risk youth through after school programs run by dedicated coaches and mentors, will provide after-school academic tutoring and mentorship for Gifford Middle School students. The program uses basketball as a tool to

attract and motivate student athletes, academic support to monitor and promote achievement and one-to-one mentors to provide local and world exposure to young minds. In that pursuit, the secondary purpose of Crossover Mission, Inc. is to build a bridge of friendship and understanding between cultures, starting at a young age, which will help to erode the walls of separation which continue to divide our society. The Crossover program consists of three important and equal components: athletics, academics, and mentoring/exposure. We work with student/players each week, year-round, training them in basketball fundamentals and fitness, supporting their academics with focus on schoolwork, mathematics, literacy, and writing.

Person Responsible Jeremy Szpaichler (jeremy.szpaichler@indianriverschools.org)

In partnership with Tykes and Teens, staff will engage in a series of professional development sessions focusing on implicit bias, culturally responsive teaching, trauma-informed care, social/emotional climate, and family engagement to impact classroom instruction and provide equitable school management strategies to improve achievement and behavioral goals for all students.

Person Responsible Tisa Blidgen (tisa.blidgen@indianriverschools.org)

Gifford Middle School will identify, attract, and retain a diverse faculty that aligns with the demographic of our student population. Research has shown that having a teacher of the same race/ethnicity can have positive impacts on a student's attitudes, motivation, and achievement (Egalite & Kisida, 2018). Minority teachers may have more positive expectations for minority students' achievement than nonminority teachers (Gershenson, Holt, & Papageorge, 2016).

Person Responsible Tosha Jones (tosha.jones@indianriverschools.org)

Gifford Middle school will utilize the role of a Success Coach to support all students academically and behaviorally supporting safe and secure school environments that are conducive to learning. The success coach will identify students requiring behavioral/academic interventions, assist with SEL, provide social skill instruction, student mentorship, implement and monitor PBIS, and provide training on effective equitable classroom management models and behavioral modification strategies.

Person Responsible Quentin Morgan (quentin.morgan@indianriverschools.org)

School based 3-3-3 Progressive Discipline Plan to ensure all disciplinary actions are administered fairly and consistently for all students. Research has shown that the implementation of punishment, especially when it is used inconsistently and in the absence of other positive strategies, is ineffective. Introducing, modeling, and reinforcing positive social behavior is an important step of a student's educational experience.

Person Responsible Jeremy Szpaichler (jeremy.szpaichler@indianriverschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

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.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

Gifford Middle School engage all stakeholders in the process of developing and maintaining professional learning communities that promote problem-solving to increase student achievement. SAC members collaboratively work to identify strategies, research-based interventions, professional development opportunities, and instructional resources. Upon the development of the SIP goals, SAC members and school stakeholders meet to share, discuss, and provide feedback on revisions to the SIP.

GMS faculty members promote strong parent, family, and community relations by modeling equity, fairness, and respect among all school stakeholders while galvanizing efforts to continually support a shared decision-making process. Family and community organization members are routinely recruited to be an active participants in formulating school improvement goals. Staff members communicate regularly through School Messenger, newsletters, open-house events, and social media. Family nights are held to engage all stakeholders in fulfilling the mission and vision of Gifford Middle School.

To start their morning students 'S.P.L.A.S.H.' into their learning environments by engaging in GMS's Social Personal Leadership Academic Study Habits time. The thirty-minute window provides students with opportunities for character building, remediation, and a platform to increase teacher-student rapport. We believe every dolphin needs a support pod - this belief has allowed for our collective pods to flourish. When identified needs are found within the MTSS problem-solving process, S.P.L.A.S.H. time allows for Tier I/II interventions to thrive with fidelitiy. In addition to the GMS Peer Mentorship Program and S.P.L.A.S.H. pods, GMS Administrators adopt two students each to 'informally' mentor and guide throughout the school year to support socially, academically, and behaviorally.

Showing ignorance towards inclusion fosters self-doubt amongst students for academic/behavioral success. Intentionally adhering to diversity within our school negates the effects of isolation, allowing for positive learning opportunities for all students to increase desired outcomes. To increase cultural literacy and ensure acceptance of diversity - GMS's Multicultural Coordinator creates culturally relevant lessons that are provided to classroom teachers to engage with students during S.P.L.A.S.H. and plans/facilitates celebrations throughout the school year including but not limited to: Hispanic History Month, Black History Month, Haitian Heritage Month, American-Indian Month, Ethnic/Equality Month, Autism Awareness Month, etc.. Each morning, the Principal shares with students culturally responsive and/or social-emotional Words of Wisdom to 'Guide Student Actions' and media clips to supporting/validating the intent of the Words of Wisdom.

To minimize interruptions during instructional time, GMS has established strong, clear F.I.N.S. Expectations: Follow Directions, Interact Safely, Negotiate Conflict and Show Respect. The GMS PBIS Program recognizes and celebrates students who follow and surpass the FINS expectations, while promoting positive pro-social behaviors. Staff members are provided training and support to build positive leaning/work environments that meet the needs of all students. The GMS F.I.N.S. expectations are taught, practiced, and reinforced throughout the year. Staff members ensure safety plans are visible and accessible in defined learning spaces and school common areas. Safety drills are conducted routinely and reviewed by the Safety Committee so that all students and staff members are knowledgeable of school-wide emergency procedures and corrective action is taken to address safety deficiencies.

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

Part V: Budget					
1 **III.A.** **Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**					**$30,500.00**
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
5100	100-Salaries	0081 - Gifford Middle School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$20,000.00
	Notes: Teacher Assistant SWD				
5100		0081 - Gifford Middle School	Title, I Part A	0.0	$2,500.00
	Notes: USA TestPrep for tested subject areas				
5100	651-Bus(es)	0081 - Gifford Middle School	Title, I Part A	0.0	$3,000.00

			Notes: Student Transportation (SDIRC) for targeted tutoring and remediation opportunities			
	5100		0081 - Gifford Middle School	Title, I Part A	0.0	$5,000.00
			Notes: Teacher stipend for after-school tutoring and remediation			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching**				**$49,900.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6300	100-Salaries	0081 - Gifford Middle School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$46,900.00
			Notes: Mathematics Instructional Coach			
	6400	330-Travel	0081 - Gifford Middle School	Title, I Part A	0.0	$3,000.00
			Notes: Reading and Math Coach Professional Development Travel			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement**				**$7,500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400		0081 - Gifford Middle School	Title, I Part A	0.0	$2,500.00
			Notes: Professional Development			
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0081 - Gifford Middle School	Title, I Part A		$5,000.00
			Notes: Supplies to support STEAM and student engagement			
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity**				**$5,733.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6150	510-Supplies	0081 - Gifford Middle School	Title, I Part A	0.0	$1,000.00
			Notes: Parent Involvement			
	6150	510-Supplies	0081 - Gifford Middle School	Title, I Part A	0.0	$2,233.00
			Notes: Parent Involvement Academic			
	6400		0081 - Gifford Middle School	Title, I Part A		$2,500.00
			Notes: Professional Development to support staff growth in culturally responsive teaching and equity			
					Total:	**$93,633.00**