

St. Johns County School District

Gamble Rogers Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Gamble Rogers Middle School

6250 US HIGHWAY 1 S, St Augustine, FL 32086

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

Demographics

Principal: Brian Wilson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 49% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (57%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Gamble Rogers Middle School

6250 US HIGHWAY 1 S, St Augustine, FL 32086

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

School Demographics

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p> | <p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">58%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">24%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
| Grade | B | B | B | B |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Gamble Rogers Middle School teachers continually collaborate to 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.

Gamble Rogers Middle School 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

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Bergamasco, Greg | Principal | |
| Middaugh, Gina | Assistant Principal | |
| Downey, Renee | Instructional Coach | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2012, Brian Wilson

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

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 | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 49% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (57%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * 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 | 295 | 287 | 315 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 897 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 20 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 27 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 24 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 8 | 17 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |

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 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/26/2020

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 | 306 | 311 | 306 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 923 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 42 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 38 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 20 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 68 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 179 |

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 | 50 | 36 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |

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 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

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 | 306 | 311 | 306 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 923 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 42 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 38 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 20 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 68 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 179 |

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 | 50 | 36 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |

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 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

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 | 54% | 68% | 54% | 54% | 69% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 51% | 59% | 54% | 48% | 61% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 40% | 48% | 47% | 37% | 50% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 68% | 77% | 58% | 64% | 76% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 54% | 68% | 57% | 53% | 65% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 60% | 51% | 45% | 55% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 57% | 70% | 51% | 50% | 69% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 86% | 88% | 72% | 88% | 87% | 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 | 55% | 74% | -19% | 54% | 1% |
| | 2018 | 56% | 71% | -15% | 52% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 55% | 72% | -17% | 52% | 3% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 70% | -17% | 51% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 50% | 71% | -21% | 56% | -6% |
| | 2018 | 60% | 76% | -16% | 58% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 66% | 74% | -8% | 55% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 68% | 73% | -5% | 52% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 65% | 80% | -15% | 54% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 66% | 80% | -14% | 54% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 57% | 78% | -21% | 46% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 54% | 73% | -19% | 45% | 9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -9% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 50% | 72% | -22% | 48% | 2% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 57% | 75% | -18% | 50% | 7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 93% | 87% | 6% | 67% | 26% |
| 2018 | 96% | 84% | 12% | 65% | 31% |
| Compare | | -3% | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 87% | 90% | -3% | 71% | 16% |
| 2018 | 90% | 89% | 1% | 71% | 19% |
| Compare | | -3% | | | |

| 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% | 79% | 16% | 61% | 34% |
| 2018 | 98% | 79% | 19% | 62% | 36% |
| Compare | | -3% | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 85% | 81% | 4% | 57% | 28% |
| 2018 | 94% | 77% | 17% | 56% | 38% |
| Compare | | -9% | | | |

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 | 22 | 44 | 41 | 33 | 46 | 42 | 31 | 65 | | | |

| 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 | 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 | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 51 | 38 | 73 | 58 | 53 | 58 | 88 | 68 | | |
| FRL | 42 | 47 | 39 | 58 | 52 | 46 | 45 | 79 | 48 | | |
| 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 | 27 | 40 | 29 | 35 | 52 | 49 | 30 | 77 | 36 | | |
| BLK | 35 | 41 | 37 | 47 | 52 | 38 | 20 | 100 | | | |
| HSP | 48 | 49 | 29 | 60 | 53 | 40 | 75 | 88 | 59 | | |
| MUL | 41 | 37 | 9 | 38 | 50 | 50 | | 67 | | | |
| WHT | 61 | 51 | 38 | 74 | 67 | 65 | 64 | 91 | 61 | | |
| FRL | 47 | 44 | 34 | 58 | 58 | 53 | 53 | 87 | 47 | | |
| 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 | 13 | 32 | 30 | 21 | 38 | 39 | 12 | 63 | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 36 | 24 | 34 | 42 | 36 | 13 | 66 | | | |
| HSP | 51 | 51 | 43 | 68 | 59 | 56 | 36 | 91 | 85 | | |
| MUL | 42 | 35 | | 63 | 54 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | 50 | 42 | 67 | 53 | 45 | 55 | 91 | 63 | | |
| FRL | 43 | 41 | 31 | 53 | 50 | 42 | 38 | 81 | 46 | | |

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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 58 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 526 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 41 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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 |
| 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 | 48 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 57 |
| 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 | 52 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| White Students | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - White Students | 60 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 51 |
| 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.

Students showed the lowest performance in our ELA FSA assessment. We are continuing to work with students we have identified to have issues with phonemic awareness.

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

Our learning gains for the lowest quartile in mathematics decreased this year. We are implementing a new model of instruction to address this with our sixth grade math team.

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.

Our lowest quartile for ELA was seven percent below the state average. We are continuing to work with students we have identified to have issues with phonemic awareness.

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

Our eighth grade math proficiency increased by 3%. We dedicated an additional support teacher in the classroom for our classes with lowest quartile math students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance continues to be a concern. We will continue to monitor this and work to identify factors contributing to student absenteeism.

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

1. ELA lowest quartile
2. Math lowest quartile
3. ELA proficiency

- 4. Math proficiency
- 5. Science proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Reading affects every content area in education. Based on our trend data this has been our lowest area historically. |
| Measurable Outcome: | We hope to achieve a 5% increase in learning gains within our ELA lowest quartile. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Greg Bergamasco (greg.bergamasco@stjohns.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | We are adding phonics instruction for the students that have been screened to show a need within our lowest quartile. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | We will use SiPPs and Wilson for phonics instruction as an additional resource for students identified to need phonics assistance. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Dedicate a teacher to our phonics intervention
2. Screen students to identify students with a need in this area
3. Schedule students for additional instruction
4. Train our staff to offer phonics instruction within our ELA classes.

Person Responsible Greg Bergamasco (greg.bergamasco@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Historically this has been an area on need at our school.

Measurable Outcome: We hope to achieve a 5% increase in learning gains within our math lowest quartile.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Greg Bergamasco (greg.bergamasco@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Provide math teachers with a full time dedicated math coach to assist in planning, instruction and assessment of students. The math coach will work closely with the math teachers to target student needs, working with students in small groups for more targeted instruction in the areas students demonstrate a need

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our math coach has shown great success in sixth grade and will continue to work with our sixth grade while assisting other grade levels.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Math coach assistance
2. New scheduling in 6th grade Math
3. New text book materials
4. Continuing the use of iReady as a diagnostic and growth monitoring tool

Person Responsible Greg Bergamasco (greg.bergamasco@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: To improve student attendance and reduce the number of students in ISS and OSS.

Measurable Outcome: GRMS will see a 5% reduction in ISS and OSS rates.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Greg Bergamasco (greg.bergamasco@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Each year we are training more of our staff to use Restorative Practices. This could influence our school culture in a positive manner as teachers, staff, and students work together on behavioral issues.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We continue to try to improve the culture at our school to become a place where students feel welcome and engaged.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Train staff members in Restorative Practice
2. Use Restorative Practice in the classrooms
3. Use Restorative Practice as part of our discipline matrix
4. Use PEER mediation as part of this process through our WEB program

Person Responsible Greg Bergamasco (greg.bergamasco@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All GRMS teachers will routinely and effectively implement student collaborative learning and writing opportunities within the classroom to increase the effectiveness of instruction and the engagement of all students.

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.

Our school is eight years into our PLC Journey and the culture of our school has continued to transform. We had many small collaborative teams that consisted of teachers from the same content area and grade level. The teachers were given time to meet together to share ideas, lessons, and strategies for teaching and learning. Teachers spent this time reviewing the grade level standards, creating common assignments, and creating activities to increase students' success. They were building relationships while extending their own understanding of the ever-changing educational landscape.

We believe that these teachers can and do provide our students with multiple exposures to similar content, create a common vocabulary that transfer between content areas and establish important links between the standards of each core class. At the beginning of each school year, a PLC Leader is chosen for each group and an online notebook was provided. The notebook contained articles and background information regarding the effective establishment of successful collaboration teams. It also contained a quarterly calendar that outlined the work of the group. This outline provided the PLCs with very detailed dates for meeting days and lists of products that the groups would submit for review by the leadership team, and in turn the leadership team would provide feedback to the PLCs in the online platform. The PLCs worked each quarter to review the standards and identify those that had a natural connection between their like content areas, or ones that could be benefited by the teaching in both classrooms. After determining the quarterly Big Ideas and a narrowed area of focus, the PLCs created a SMARTe (we added the "e" for everyone) Goal. Then the teachers co-labored to create a strategic plan of instruction and a common assessment that could be administered in each content area classroom, as well as electives. After the assessment was given, the data was examined and the four questions of a PLC, and their answers were reviewed. At the end each school year the teachers overwhelmingly agree that this process is the most positive and helpful shift in thinking they have been involved in for quite some time.

The grade level/content area PLCs are the smallest unit in the larger PLC that is our school. We have seen so much success in so many areas. These successes continue to increase the capacity of everyone involved. While we are eight years into this amazing journey, we know that we are still growing and learning each day. There are great new adventures awaiting us and we are eager to see where this path takes us and our students.

We are now a Model AVID school as well as a Model PLC school. PLCs are crucial to our success with implementing AVID school wide. We continue to host visitors from other counties who want to learn how we structure our school to achieve our levels of success. At each visitation, we always make it clear that our success is driven by the power of our PLCs.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.