

St. Johns County School District

Gamble Rogers Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Gamble Rogers Middle School

6250 US HIGHWAY 1 S, St Augustine, FL 32086

<http://www-grms.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

GRMS will create the best learning path for all students. Students understand the value of being engaged in their education as goal-setting, college and career bound questioners, who recognize the value of all learning opportunities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

GRMS will be a progressive school in which students are prepared to achieve at their highest level, preparing them for college and career, surrounded by an engaged community that is proud of its educational accomplishments.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wilson, Brian	Principal	Initiate, collaborate, review, and approve our school improvement planning. Also, oversee the implementation of the SIP.
Cullipher, Daryl	Assistant Principal	Collaborator on the process as well as an essential element of the execution of the SIP.
Downey, Renee	Assistant Principal	Collaborator on the process as well as an essential element of the execution of the SIP.
Penn, Julie	Parent Engagement Liaison	Collaborator on the process, writer of the plan, and an essential element of the execution of the SIP.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team created a framework for the SIP, then met with stakeholder groups to share and get feedback. Given how early in the school year the plan was due, we had not yet had a SAC meeting, nor a PTO mtg. We met with four parents and two members of our community via Teams. We also met with a group of student leaders during a leadership/service class, as well as two classroom teachers. We shared data reflecting the Early Warning Systems and Subgroups because making positive strides in these areas is the key to demonstrating improvement as a school. We took their

feedback and made some modifications when possible and when not feasible, shared why certain interventions or strategies may not be possible given financial and other constraints.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Our SIP will be reviewed each quarter based on the FAST data, student classroom progress, and attendance. As students are identified having made significant progress, we will discuss with parents whether small groups should continue. As students are newly identified as being in need of tier 2 interventions, we will include them in our small groups. PLCs are able to recommend students who may have begun struggling to meet grade level academic expectations. Our newly purchased GradeCam offers as effective way for teachers to gather and analyze formative and summative data. We believe our staffing will allow for approximately 100 students to be working in small groups with our interventionists during any given week. We will also examine attendance data each interim and communicate with parents if students have missed 10% or more of the schools to that point. This will be above and beyond the normal guidelines expected by the district to address truancy.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	24%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	49%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	74	93	248	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	66	63	191	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	51	37	117	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	58	73	179	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	55	88	201	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	30	59	114	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	75	73	210

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	79	69	222	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	53	60	177	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	30	17	56	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	9	29	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	61	71	187	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	55	46	151	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	128	152	406	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	70	69	193

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	79	69	222
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	53	60	177
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	30	17	56
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	9	29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	61	71	187
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	55	46	151
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	128	152	406

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	70	69	193

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	52			54			54		
ELA Learning Gains	44			49			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34			36			40		
Math Achievement*	62			61			68		
Math Learning Gains	51			44			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41			39			48		
Science Achievement*	55			53			57		
Social Studies Achievement*	85			88			86		
Middle School Acceleration	59			59			68		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	483
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	1	1
ELL	29	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	54			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	43			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	52	44	34	62	51	41	55	85	59			
SWD	16	28	26	25	35	34	17	48	29			
ELL	27	45		36	9							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	26	25	31	31	22	24	67				
HSP	47	44	39	57	47	31	60	85	74			
MUL	64	53		74	66		64	92	73			
PAC												
WHT	55	46	35	66	53	48	57	87	55			
FRL	36	37	35	50	47	38	38	71	36			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	54	49	36	61	44	39	53	88	59			
SWD	21	33	28	28	36	29	24	61	17			
ELL					50							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	25	8	32	34	29	15	85				
HSP	57	55	48	74	57	53	58	96	57			
MUL	53	54	50	47	32	18	47	92				
PAC												
WHT	57	51	38	63	44	41	57	87	61			
FRL	36	36	27	46	35	33	39	85	31			

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	54	51	40	68	54	48	57	86	68			
SWD	22	44	41	33	46	42	31	65				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	45	45	36	39	31	50	75	80			
HSP	55	54	33	68	51	50	60	77	61			
MUL	45	64	63	55	38	31	36	83				
PAC												
WHT	57	51	38	73	58	53	58	88	68			
FRL	42	47	39	58	52	46	45	79	48			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school 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 math data does continue to show improvement, therefore the component that showed the lowest performance was the ELA learning gains which was a 6-point decrease from the prior years. This was evident in both our general population and in certain subgroups. The downward trend goes from 51% in 2019, to 49% in 2021, and 44% in 2022. During 2021-2022 school year, many students were returning from distance learning from over a year off of school, and many students were also quarantined throughout the first semester of this school year. In addition, achievement data was not distributed until August, which left little time for disaggregation of data and the generation of data-based plans for tailored student support, and placement.

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

The most glaring area of decline is our ELA Learning Gains for or lowest achieving students, especially the subgroups of SWD and Black students. Our ELA Learning Gains for SWD dropped 16 pts from 2019 to 2022, and 18 points for Black students in the same time period. Similarly, the ELA Learning Gains for our Low 25 dropped 15 points between 2019 and 2022, 18 points for Black students during the same time period. The numbers are remarkably similar, leading us to believe that much of the impact on our overall ELA Learning gain results were due to the results of our Lowest 25. Between 2019 and 2022 there were many potential factors that may have impacted student achievement, most notably the loss of learning during COVID. The increase of virtual learning combined with a decrease of individual and small group instruction, would likely have a more negative impact on students who need the most support. Certainly, as noted in many of their IEPs, our SWD benefit from one-one and/or small group instruction, learning practices that were often missing or discouraged between March 2020 and May 2021, even leading into the first semester of the 2021-2022 school year. This learning loss has not only impacted academic performance, but also has negatively impacted behaviors that lead to an environment less conducive to learning. This has been improving of late, but our analysis of data is restricted to results from more than a year ago due to the changes in our state assessment.

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 greatest negative gap relative to state data was for black students in ELA Learning Gains, minus 24, and Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25, minus 29. These deficits of learning are glaring and must be addressed. It is unclear why these deficits are significantly greater than others, but one possibility is that too many of these same students fall into subgroups that also demonstrated less achievement, such as SWD and/or FRL. Additionally, there are not a large percentage of black students in our student population, so smaller numbers of variations within the subgroup create proportionally larger changes in outcomes, whether positive or negative.

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

There was modest improvement in Math from 2021 to 2022. Overall achievement improved from 61 to 62, while Learning gains and Lowest 25% improved by 7 and 2 points respectively. We hired three teachers prior to the 2021-2022 school year. Our math coach at the time worked diligently with the less

experienced teacher. These teachers blended well with our team and maintained, even gained, achievement to a small degree. We also believe one year of a more normal school year after COVID may account for some of the gains. Perhaps students were able to more quickly recover learning loss in math than ELA/Reading.

We did not notice any measurable improvements between 2019 and 2022. This does not surprise us greatly, given that the learning process was significantly impacted in a negative way during this time, not just in our school but across the country.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The data indicate that 248 of our students were absent at least 10% of the days. Thus, approximately 28% of our students missed 18 or more days of school. This seems excessive and likely plays a factor in students' ability to learn and achieve to their full potential.

Another area of concern is that approximately 20% of our students scored a level 1 on the end of year test. Nearly twice as many students scored a level 1 on ELA than did on math. It is notable that about 7% more 8th graders than 6th scored a level 1, indicating that performance is dipping during their time in middle school.

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

ELA/Reading for Students with Disabilities

ELA/Reading for Black students

ELA/Reading for ELL students

Attendance rate for all students

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The number of students missing more than 10%, the number of students having served ISS or OSS, as well as the % of students scoring a level 1 on the FSA, were all of great concern. It is entirely possible, if not likely, that many of the students missing more than 10% of the days were not happy at school, or at least did not feel they were learning sufficiently to make the necessary effort to be present. The number of suspensions is an indicator that the environment was not conducive to learning, at least not as consistently as we would hope. And the resulting outcome of poor attendance and disruptive behaviors is too often that these same students do not achieve to their ability. Additionally, other students impacted by misbehaviors in the classroom may also achieve below their ability.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By focusing on these early warning signs, we expect to have fewer students absent for 10% or more school days, fewer students serving ISS/OSS, and fewer students scoring at the lowest level of the statewide ELA/Math assessments. Our goal is to reduce the % of students absent at least 10% of the days from 28% to 23%. Another related goal is to reduce the % of students assigned ISS/OSS from 22% to 17%. The third component of the Early Warning System is more difficult to assess. We are not certain how results may be impacted as the test is normed based on initial results. However, if all things were equal, we would hope to improve in this area by at least 5% points as well, with a goal of no more than 15% of students earning a level 1 on the state assessment, now FAST.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

One of our APs works with the two school counselors to monitor attendance. We will plan to make early contact with parents as their student begins to demonstrate a pattern of poor attendance, including a lack of communication when their student is not at school. As part of our PBIS program, we will also check every interim to see how many students have been assigned ISS or OSS. Grades are checked at interims as well to see how well students are progressing in their classes, especially their core classes. And finally, PLCs will examine students' results on each FAST progress monitoring test to check for progress towards performing at grade level.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Renee Downey (renee.downey@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We have made great strides in enhancing our evidence-based intervention, PBIS. There are many opportunities for students to be rewarded for demonstrating character, academic achievement, and good citizenship.

These include weekly drawings (Rays fever), Student of the Week and Student of the Month for each grade level based on teacher nominations and voting, Quarterly Field Days for students having no referrals or ISS/OSS, Ice Cream Socials each interim for students having grades of C or above, School Dances where qualify by receiving no full days of ISS/OSS, Rays of the Quarter for students most exemplifying the four keys traits above, and an Honor Roll Movie for A/B students at the end of the year. Thanks to community partners and teachers, we have doubled opportunities for Mentoring and Clubs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We feel these and PBIS will help create an environment where students want to learn, increasing achievement, behaviors, and attendance. We have also decreased the time span between reward opportunities, hoping that many more students will have a better chance and earning and enjoying them.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The activities associate with our PBIS plan are ongoing daily. We have communicated with students the expectations for certain rewards, and had our first Students of the Week, and Staff Spotlights. These were shared with parents in our weekly news and the SOW were posted on our digital sign, which will continue moving forward. Attendance will be assessed each week to determine which families need to be contacted regrading unexcused absences/truancy, or having trouble getting their student to school on-time.

Person Responsible: Renee Downey (renee.downey@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our SWD performed 36 points below our school on the ELA/Reading FSA in 2022, a pass rate of 16 compared to 52. These same students also score 37 points below our school on the Math FSA in 2022, a pass rate of 25 compared to 62. Both of these are far below the minimum expectations of 41.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our goal is that at least 41% of our SWD will score a 3 or more on the ELA FAST and Math FAST the spring of 2024.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor this by analyzing results from PM1 and PM2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Penn (julie.penn@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students in need of Tier 2 support will be placed in small groups with our academic interventionist once or twice a week. Students will be pulled from an elective class. All students receive Tier 1 instruction that includes AVID strategies. About half our teacher have attended AVID training and we have several teachers capable of providing PD for teachers inexperienced at implementing AVID strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The purpose of this strategy is to provide more targeted support in an environment where students feel comfortable asking questions. We plan to have no more than 6 students in a small group at any point in time and allow for up to 40 minutes each session. Also, the implementation of AVID is designed to engage students in varying ways to reach the different learning styles of students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Our Academic Interventionists will begin working with "bubble" students based on last year's FAST. Students will be pulled from PE or another elective class twice per week. Once PM1 has taken place, Our AI will collaborate with ELA and Reading teachers to maintain a manageable list of students to support each week, continuing to monitor progress. As students demonstrate ample improvement, they will be monitored but may be removed from small groups, allowing for new students to benefit from the additional support.

Person Responsible: Julie Penn (julie.penn@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our Black students performed 29 points below our school on the ELA/Reading FSA in 2022, a pass rate of 23 compared to 52. These same students also score 31 points below our school on the Math FSA in 2022, a pass rate of 31 compared to 62. Both of these are far below the minimum expectations of 41.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our goal is that at least 41% of our Black students will score a 3 or more on the ELA FAST and Math FAST the spring of 2024.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor this by analyzing results from PM1 and PM2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Penn (julie.penn@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students in need of Tier 2 support will be placed in small groups with our academic interventionist once or twice a week. Students will be pulled from an elective class. All students receive Tier 1 instruction that includes AVID strategies. About half our teacher have attended AVID training and we have several teachers capable of providing PD for teachers inexperienced at implementing AVID strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The purpose of this strategy is to provide more targeted support in an environment where students feel comfortable asking questions. We plan to have no more than 4 students in a small group at any point in time and allow for up to 40 minutes each session. Also, the implementation of AVID is designed to engage students in varying ways to reach the different learning styles of students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Our Academic Interventionists will begin working with "bubble" students based on last year's FAST. Students will be pulled from PE or another elective class twice per week. Once PM1 has taken place, Our AI will collaborate with ELA and Reading teachers to maintain a manageable list of students to support each week, continuing to monitor progress. As students demonstrate ample improvement, they will be monitored but may be removed from small groups, allowing for new students to benefit from the additional support.

Person Responsible: Julie Penn (julie.penn@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our ELL students performed 25 points below our school on the ELA/Reading FSA in 2022, a pass rate of 27 compared to 52. These same students also score 26 points below our school on the Math FSA in 2022, a pass rate of 36 compared to 62. Both of these are far below the minimum expectations of 41.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our goal is that at least 41% of our ELL students will score a 3 or more on the ELA FAST and Math FAST the spring of 2024.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor this by analyzing results from PM1 and PM2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students in need of Tier 2 support will be placed in small groups with our academic interventionist once or twice a week. Students will be pulled from an elective class. All students receive Tier 1 instruction that includes AVID strategies. About half our teacher have attended AVID training and we have several teachers capable of providing PD for teachers inexperienced at implementing AVID strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The purpose of this strategy is to provide more targeted support in an environment where students feel comfortable asking questions. We plan to have no more than 4 students in a small group at any point in time and allow for up to 40 minutes each session. Also, the implementation of AVID is designed to engage students in varying ways to reach the different learning styles of students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Our Academic Interventionists will begin working with "bubble" students based on last year's FAST. Students will be pulled from PE or another elective class twice per week. Once PM1 has taken place, Our AI will collaborate with ELA and Reading teachers to maintain a manageable list of students to support each week, continuing to monitor progress. As students demonstrate ample improvement, they will be monitored but may be removed from small groups, allowing for new students to benefit from the additional support.

Person Responsible: Julie Penn (julie.penn@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Our SAC (School Advisory Council) meets monthly. Associated funding allocations must be approved by this council and will be tied only to the goals outlined in our School Improvement Plan. At this time, we anticipate the most likely needs will be related to our small groups referenced in the Areas of Focus plans. These interventions are directly related to the strategies planned to improve our ESSE subgroup data.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The methods that Gamble will use to disseminate our SIP will begin with inviting students and parents to an Open House night in September. We will break down the plan into simpler terms using a Power Point presentation using accessible language for the many acronyms found in this plan. We will also present this at our September PTO and SAC meeting to further our outreach to stakeholders. Our staff will be invited to this as well, or they will be able to access this year's SIP on our school's webpage:
<https://www-grms.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Our school's mission to provide the best learning path for students has many working parts. Our Stingray News communication goes out to parents and teachers to keep them informed of events on a weekly basis. Included in this communication are reminders about how to access resources on our Schoology pages to keep up to date with their child's progress. We also send flyers home on a regular basis to increase participation in after-school activities to keep our students engaged in learning and extra-curricular activities such as Robotics Club, The Art of Play, tutoring, and a variety of sports opportunities. We've also just implemented a community out-reach plan to distribute food to families in need in partnership with Regeneration Fellowship Church. Food and supplies are made available everything Thursday for families who need it. Take-home meals are also available to our students every Wednesday to help fill any gaps in the early release schedule. Our arts department also does an

excellent job with pulling in parents to semester events celebrating student achievement in digital and fine arts, band, chorus, theatre, and yearbook classes. Interactive booths are set up for children of all ages to participate in make and take crafts hosted by our PTO volunteers. Our plan for 2023-2024 is to expand these celebrations with more focused booths to spotlight our academic programs like accelerated classes, the AVID elective, and Battle of the Books. It is our hope that the more we present to parents at these events, the more they will take an interest in our school and feel a part of our community.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(ii))

One Area of Focus we will focus on to strengthen our academic program is addressing our students who are reading well below grade level. 22% of our students scored a level 1 on the reading assessment. We screen all level 1/2 students using the Core Phonics screener to determine the correct placement in one of three levels of intensive reading classes. Our newest addition is the implementation of two interventionists who will provide small group instruction for targeted groups such as SWD and level 1/2 readers. This is in addition to instruction received in ELA and Intensive Reading classes. We will also use these resources to accelerate curriculum by pulling small groups who have mastered the curriculum and would benefit from the challenge of enrichment.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Gamble's RTI Core Team meets every Wednesday to address the needs of students. We pull together the school psychologist, guidance counselors, the ILC, assistant principal, the behavior specialist, and the social worker to voice concerns brought to our attention from parents or teachers. We develop a plan of action for each student's needs, which usually starts with counselor check-ins or a referral to our onsite mental health counselor. Our social worker steps in to connect families to outside counseling service or resources if needed. These concerns may develop into further steps such as putting a safety plan in place, a referral to the RTI process, or updating IEP goals if applicable. We are proud to offer again this year our lunch mentoring program, where adult volunteers mentor kids in need, and our GEMS club. Girls Empowered in Middle School is sponsored by Hugs Across the County and provides our girls with guest speakers to address topics relating to overcoming challenges and leading a healthy lifestyle. We've seen such success with our students in just the short time that we've had these connections available. Our goal for 2023-2024 is to expand these lunch groups with one focused on ASD learners.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Our Career Coach organizes a Job/Career Fair during the first semester. This exposes students to the Career Academies available in our district. We also have some area employers come to share at their booth career opportunities that exist and what, if any, post-secondary schooling/training may be necessary.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We have an MTSS team that meets twice a week to discuss, plan, and monitor our students' needs. Some students are eventually assessed and placed in the ESE program, while others need additional supports such as small groups to address their academic needs, or interventions that are supported by our behavior interventionist. Parents are involved early on, and we maintain communication during each of the MTSS process.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

To retain effective teachers, we pair all new teachers with a trained mentor to provide support throughout the year. We base our professional development on the needs of teachers by monitoring subgroups through our PLC process. The admin team are better able to address needs if we are there with them as they plan for instruction, review data, and implement plans for enrichment and intervention during our bimonthly PLC Wednesday meetings.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A