

St. Lucie Public Schools

Forest Grove Middle School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Forest Grove Middle School

3201 S 25TH ST, Fort Pierce, FL 34981

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/fgm/>

Demographics

Principal: Keonisha Bobo

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (53%)
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	ATSI

* 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. Lucie County School Board on 10/11/2022.

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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Forest Grove Middle School

3201 S 25TH ST, Fort Pierce, FL 34981

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/fgm/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>84%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>84%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C	C	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/11/2022.

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.

The mission of Forest Grove Middle School is to provide a dynamic, enriching environment where students are empowered, with the help of family and the community, to become compassionate life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to empower students with skills for the 21st century through rigorous academic curriculum, while promoting a culture of cooperation and active participation, where all are Respected and achievement is Expected.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bobo, Keonisha	Principal	The principal serves as an instructional leader school-wide, supervising operations and personnel for the entire school environment. A concentrated focus this year on ELA, Social Studies, and Science. The principal role also entails overseeing compliance with district policies, success of instructional programs, and operation of all school based activities.
Barriner, Katina	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach (Barriner) works with the English Department to create high-quality lesson plans and then follow-up with the classroom support and feedback with teachers. She will also work closely with new teachers to ensure each understands the depth of the standards that must be taught. She will share content knowledge and model effective instructional practices. Furthermore, Barriner will assist in spearheading instructional professional development trainings based on improving areas of concern within classroom instruction
Rogers, April	Reading Coach	The Reading Coach (Rogers) works with Reading and Social Studies departments to create high-quality lesson plans and then follow-up with classroom support and provides feedback to teachers. She will also work closely with new teachers to ensure they understand the depth of the standards that must be taught. She will share content knowledge and model effective instructional practices. Furthermore, Rogers will facilitate instructional professional development trainings based on improving areas of concerns within the classroom.
Edmondson, Udeen	Math Coach	The instructional coach (Edmonson - Taylor) works with the Math Department to create high-quality lesson plans and then follow-up with the classroom support and feedback with teachers. She will also work closely with new teachers to ensure each understands the depth of the standards that must be taught. She will share content knowledge and model effective instructional practices. Furthermore, Ms.Edmonson-Taylor will assist in spearheading instructional professional development trainings based on improving areas of concern within classroom instruction
Person, DaShan	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal serves as an instructional leader school-wide, supervising operations and personnel for identified areas of the school environment. The assistant principal focus will support Math and elective classes. The assistant principal role also entails overseeing compliance with district policies, success of instructional programs, and operation of all school based activities. In addition, Ms. Person oversees teacher certification and all events that occur on and off campus.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/25/2022, Keonisha Bobo

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

38

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

983

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

15

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

17

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	294	284	289	0	0	0	0	867
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	141	132	0	0	0	0	408
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	68	56	0	0	0	0	192
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	6	1	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	8	2	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	102	103	0	0	0	0	298
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	103	95	0	0	0	0	303
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	155	126	110	0	0	0	0	391

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	155	144	147	0	0	0	0	446

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	2	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/25/2022

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	309	283	285	0	0	0	0	877
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	118	126	0	0	0	0	381
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	33	29	0	0	0	0	102
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	28	84	0	0	0	0	140
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	16	53	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	90	77	0	0	0	0	266
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	102	94	0	0	0	0	325
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	27	3	0	0	0	0	90

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	158	129	138	0	0	0	0	425

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	8	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	11

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	309	283	285	0	0	0	0	877
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	118	126	0	0	0	0	381
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	33	29	0	0	0	0	102
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	28	84	0	0	0	0	140
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	16	53	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	90	77	0	0	0	0	266
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	102	94	0	0	0	0	325
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	27	3	0	0	0	0	90

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	158	129	138	0	0	0	0	425

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	8	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	11

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	43%	39%	50%				47%	44%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	46%						58%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%						52%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	41%	37%	36%				41%	45%	58%
Math Learning Gains	59%						50%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%						58%	51%	51%
Science Achievement	35%	39%	53%				42%	41%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	56%	52%	58%				65%	64%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2022					
	2019	41%	51%	-10%	54%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	44%	49%	-5%	52%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
08	2022					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	23%	47%	-24%	55%	-32%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	41%	50%	-9%	54%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
08	2022					
	2019	20%	34%	-14%	46%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	39%	48%	-9%	48%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	61%	67%	-6%	71%	-10%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	79%	51%	28%	61%	18%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	88%	55%	33%	57%	31%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	19	35	30	24	49	47	12	24			
ELL	35	46	42	35	57	63	26	53	72		
BLK	29	41	31	25	55	61	21	41	88		
HSP	44	48	41	43	58	68	34	60	75		
MUL	67	50		61	64						
WHT	63	47	33	67	70	72	60	76	93		
FRL	39	44	31	38	58	64	31	52	86		
2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	19	31	20	20	44	45	9	29			
ELL	28	41	37	28	45	52	15	51	67		
ASN	70	60		60	50						

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
BLK	26	38	30	18	33	42	20	39	43		
HSP	46	46	36	39	48	53	34	54	76		
MUL	67	56		39	44						
WHT	62	53	33	57	46	55	66	60	88		
FRL	39	43	33	31	42	48	32	46	74		
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	25	42	34	21	57	52	24	44			
ELL	20	52	55	19	45	64	14	48			
ASN	90	80		90	80						
BLK	34	48	46	27	48	55	33	56	77		
HSP	47	60	57	39	44	58	34	65	76		
MUL	45	62		43	64			40			
WHT	69	67	54	70	60	63	71	87	90		
FRL	41	56	50	33	45	56	33	57	75		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	503
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	43
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	51
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	61
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	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	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Learning gains and the lowest 25% math scores improved significantly for all all subgroups. ELA proficiency along with learning gains and lowest quartile remained somewhat consistent based on last years data. Science proficiency for 8th grade did not improve and most students identified in the lowest quartile in math and reading did not obtain proficiency. Civic scores improved for 4% of the ELA lowest quartile students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA lowest quartile students are identified as the greatest need for improvement. Previous year data indicates that low level readers continue to make necessary gains to increase in scores and move in to proficiency.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

We believe that students attendance was a key factor in the lack of learning gains and proficiency. Another contributing factor is reading stamina and language acquisition restraints for English Language Learners. We have implemented an English Language Development course for first year ELL students as well as identifying more students to receive tier 3 reading intervention.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Unit assessments and common check for understandings, bell ringers, exit tickets, and teacher feedback was utilized consistently to make revisions and create re-teaching opportunities. Students were exposed to information and content to deepen understanding and received multiple levels of support during instruction.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The contributing factors for improvement was double blocking math classes and incorporating I-Ready Math to help students improve on concepts that they are low in. Math content was also supported by the math coach through small group instruction. The collaborative lesson planning process help to identify additional interventions, resources, and coaching for students and teachers to master standards.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Increase of student reading across all content areas to build vocabulary and fluency. Providing students an opportunity to be immersed in reading interventions by identifying individual reading deficiencies that better support student needs. Additionally, an increase of student writing across all content areas to help build on students' comprehension while comprehending, analyzing, and responding to text.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will consistently progress monitor and address academic and behavioral needs of students as well as participate in district professional developments that focus on standard base instruction with an emphasis on rigor, interventions, and enrichment opportunities for all students.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Small group instruction, an increase in collaborative planning and professional development, and before and after school tutoring.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

According to our data progress monitoring data, ELA proficiency and Learning Gains did not improve as related to prior years data. By focusing on this area, it not only supports our ELA efforts but also provides a stronger foundation that is necessary for student success in other content areas.

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

Our goal is to increase our ELA proficiency by 5 points, lowest 25% by 10 points and learning gains by 10 points. This increase will for each category will indicate moving our most fragile students closer to proficiency which will close the decrease the learning gap.

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

Monitoring will be conducted through review of assessment data (unit assessments, performance tasks, and benchmarks) after every assessment to ensure our students are on track and are continuing to exhibit growth in literacy.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katina Barriner (katina.barriner@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Critical thinking classes that focus on reading strategies and comprehension for level 1's and 2 readers that cover ELA and Reading content and standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Students who struggle with reading need additional support with most content. During their critical thinking class students will receive small group instruction and online tutorial support to target identified deficiencies.

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.

- I-Ready
- Small group instruction
- Office of Teaching and Learning supplemental materials
- Reading interventionist support
- Critical Thinking comprehension support

Person Responsible April Rogers (april.rogers@stlucieschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

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

Math lowest 25% and learning gains made a significant increase. We will continue to focus on these areas however, we will also focus on increasing our math fluency for level 2 students that continue to show progress with math skills and concepts.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Through collaborative lesson planning teachers will review and discuss unit assessments and performance tasks data. The math coach and assistant principal will attend meetings to ensure best practices are utilized for instruction and student tasks.

Monitoring:

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

Level 1 students are scheduled in to intensive math and will work on math concepts to improve foundational math concepts and skills. Students will participate in small group instruction and work with whole number fluency drills to increase mastery.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Keonisha Bobo (keonisha.bobo@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Level 1 and level 2 students will complete ongoing check for understandings as well as create individual goals to track their progress. Students will receive additional support through re-teaching, small group instruction, and one on conferencing. Schedule level 1 students with math interventionist for tier 3 instruction. The math coach will support the teachers through small group pullout and planning and coaching.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Level 1 students will have multiple opportunities to increase math performance and receive a tiered approach to improving math fluency.

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.

- Schedule students into Intensive Math
- Schedule tier 3 students with math interventionist
- Online tutorial (FEV) support

Math coach support CLP

Person Responsible Keonisha Bobo (keonisha.bobo@stlucieschools.org)

#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 critical need from the data reviewed.

FGMS has a large population of English Language Learners that are exhibiting minimal growth as compared to other subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:

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

English Language Learners will make at least 10% academic growth as evidence on I-Ready Diagnostic, WIDA assessments and Benchmark exams.

Monitoring:

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

FGMS has implemented an English Language Development course that includes lesson plans and content to address the needs of our ELL students. In addition, we have increased the number of teachers that provide push-in support to accommodate the needs of our ELL students in general education settings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Our targeted English Language Learners will be provided small group instruction and remediation to focus on language acquisition, math and reading fluency, and identified areas of concern through progress monitoring and teacher observation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Pulling small groups and utilizing high-yield effect strategies such as co-teacher facilitation of instruction with English and students native language that focus on standard base instruction. As well as curriculu designed by our district's ESOL department.

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.

Identified ELA Teacher will co-teach with ELD teacher for small group instruction. The ELD teacher will also provide push-in support for identified ELL classes.

Person Responsible

Katina Barriner (katina.barriner@stlucieschools.org)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NON-APPLICABLE

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NON-APPLICABLE

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

NON-APPLICABLE

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NON-APPLICABLE

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

NON-APPLICABLE

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Bobo, Keonisha, keonisha.bobo@stlucieschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

NON-APPLICABLE

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NON-APPLICABLE

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

NON-APPLICABLE

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Implementing a positive school culture and environment is identified throughout the course of the school year and during the summer months. All stakeholders participate in professional development sessions that support and enhance the development of team building, school community, and school pride. The PBIS initiative that is being implemented at Forest Grove Middle promotes positive school culture by recognizing students via positive referrals, students that are following the BARK expectations will receive Bulldog bucks from teachers and faculty members, students without any referrals will be able to participate in the monthly PBIS initiatives, and a school store will be put into our plan for students to spend their bulldog bucks.

To promote positive culture and environment with teachers and faculty we have teacher/staff of the month, colleague to colleague recognition, and teacher shout-outs in the weekly bulletin.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

At Forest Grove Middle School we are continuing to build on our upward climb in promoting a positive culture and environment.

Faculty- We are continuing to seek and hire a diverse group of teachers that are eager to work with students of the community that we service. Encouraging our teachers to promote a positive school culture environment by incorporating best practices in the classroom that will promote academic success for all students.

Students- Our focus is on a Single School Culture, where all are respected and academic achievement is expected. We are creating a culture where students feel safe & trust any adult they can reach out to in the school if they have or see a issue/concern. Additionally our PBIS plan promotes positive school culture and environment for all students.

Parents- Parents provide input to the leadership team, as the school has an open door policy. Parents are invited to all award ceremonies, open house/orientation and other activities on campus. Community members and parents are apart of school committees and provide mentorship to our students . Furthermore, parents have an opportunity to provide input in our SAC, MOA-Prep, and Title I monthly meeting events.