

Clay County Schools

Green Cove Springs Junior High 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 | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Green Cove Springs Junior High School

1220 BONAVENTURE AVE, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://gcj.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Justin FAU Lkner

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 7-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2021-22 Title I School | No |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 41% |
| 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: B (61%) 2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (66%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| 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 is pending approval by the Clay County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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 | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Green Cove Springs Junior High School

1220 BONAVENTURE AVE, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://gcj.oneclay.net>

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School 7-8 | No | 41% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 40% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay County School Board.

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 Green Cove Springs Junior High is to achieve academic excellence by cultivating student ownership, developing lifelong learners, and fostering a safe, caring culture that benefits the entire community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Green Cove Springs Junior High will provide quality education in a safe environment for our diverse student population where social responsibility is fostered and all students are motivated to master academic goals.

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Faulkner, Justin | Principal | Ensure compliance with established rules, and laws in the daily operation of the school. Develop and foster good public relations, efficient school volunteer/ partnership programs, effective conferencing and communications with parents, students, and teachers. Coordinate and monitor the curricular program of the school to maximize student learning; conduct faculty/staff meetings as needed to meet student instructional needs; implement the Sunshine State Standards. |
| Demarie, James | Assistant Principal | The assistant/vice principal is directly responsible to the school principal. He/she serves in a staff relationship with other assistant administrators in the school. Assume all administrative duties in absence of the principal. Assist in fulfilling any duties outlined on the principal's job description and delegated by the principal. |
| Green, Monica | Assistant Principal | The assistant/vice principal is directly responsible to the school principal. He/she serves in a staff relationship with other assistant administrators in the school. Assume all administrative duties in absence of the principal. Assist in fulfilling any duties outlined on the principal's job description and delegated by the principal. |
| Bleau, Chera | Teacher, K-12 | The teacher is responsible directly to the principal for the instruction, supervision, and evaluation of students. Establish a classroom climate conducive to learning classroom management. Demonstrate an interest in and a willingness to assist students inside and outside the classroom. Provide for students of varying ability through the use of a variety of activities, techniques, questions, materials and student input (compensate for individual deprivations). |
| Taft, William | Teacher, K-12 | The teacher is responsible directly to the principal for the instruction, supervision, and evaluation of students. Establish a classroom climate conducive to learning classroom management. Demonstrate an interest in and a willingness to assist students inside and outside the classroom. Provide for students of varying ability through the use of a variety of activities, techniques, questions, materials and student input (compensate for individual deprivations). |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Justin FAU Lkner

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.*

23

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

812

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

8

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

9

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 | 0 | 420 | 392 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 812 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 200 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 | |

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 | 0 | 68 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 |

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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/6/2022

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 | 0 | 391 | 412 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 803 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

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 | 0 | 391 | 412 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 803 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

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 | 61% | 56% | 50% | | | | 65% | 61% | 54% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 52% | | | | | | 61% | 58% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 31% | | | | | | 56% | 49% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | 67% | 33% | 36% | | | | 80% | 69% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 62% | | | | | | 75% | 63% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 51% | | | | | | 69% | 56% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 69% | 64% | 53% | | | | 70% | 66% | 51% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 79% | 59% | 58% | | | | 78% | 81% | 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 |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 59% | 4% | 52% | 11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 68% | 62% | 6% | 56% | 12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -63% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 78% | 63% | 15% | 54% | 24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 61% | 49% | 12% | 46% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -78% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 64% | 5% | 48% | 21% |
| 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 | 78% | 80% | -2% | 71% | 7% |

| 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 | 97% | 65% | 32% | 61% | 36% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 100% | 64% | 36% | 57% | 43% |

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 | 23 | 32 | 23 | 32 | 42 | 45 | 33 | 52 | 74 | | |
| ELL | 21 | 41 | 26 | 52 | 59 | 29 | 25 | 44 | | | |
| ASN | 84 | 88 | | 100 | 86 | | 91 | 100 | 100 | | |
| BLK | 40 | 41 | 21 | 43 | 58 | 58 | 43 | 71 | 70 | | |
| HSP | 53 | 50 | 33 | 58 | 55 | 42 | 62 | 71 | 77 | | |
| MUL | 69 | 50 | | 62 | 61 | | 73 | 80 | 69 | | |
| WHT | 65 | 52 | 34 | 73 | 63 | 45 | 76 | 81 | 71 | | |
| FRL | 47 | 45 | 29 | 51 | 57 | 46 | 50 | 70 | 66 | | |
| 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 | 18 | 27 | 22 | 23 | 29 | 28 | 29 | 52 | 52 | | |
| ELL | 20 | 29 | 18 | 25 | 42 | 43 | 17 | 55 | | | |
| ASN | 82 | 68 | | 82 | 68 | | 71 | 90 | 81 | | |
| BLK | 41 | 35 | 18 | 39 | 23 | 25 | 37 | 51 | 81 | | |
| HSP | 54 | 51 | 28 | 55 | 50 | 37 | 59 | 72 | 71 | | |
| MUL | 68 | 65 | | 58 | 33 | | 67 | | 85 | | |
| WHT | 64 | 55 | 37 | 70 | 58 | 55 | 71 | 86 | 80 | | |
| FRL | 43 | 45 | 33 | 45 | 49 | 44 | 47 | 65 | 55 | | |
| 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 | 31 | 49 | 50 | 52 | 67 | 60 | 45 | 47 | 38 | | |
| ELL | 15 | 31 | | 46 | 80 | 73 | | | | | |

| 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 |
| ASN | 84 | 69 | | 90 | 82 | | 75 | 100 | 76 | | |
| BLK | 44 | 44 | 42 | 58 | 76 | 71 | 47 | 59 | 62 | | |
| HSP | 61 | 63 | 54 | 73 | 69 | 54 | 52 | 75 | 76 | | |
| MUL | 59 | 67 | | 88 | 75 | | 69 | 92 | 75 | | |
| WHT | 69 | 62 | 61 | 84 | 75 | 71 | 76 | 81 | 74 | | |
| FRL | 48 | 53 | 55 | 66 | 73 | 66 | 55 | 64 | 52 | | |

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 | 57 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 27 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 572 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 40 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 36 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 93 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 49 |
| 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 | 53 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 66 |
| 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 | 62 |
| 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 |

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?

Based on the most recent state assessment data, ELA proficiency data has remained consistent at 61% as has ELA LQ Learning Gains at 31%. Math showed significant gains with Lower Quartile students from 44% in 2021 to 51% in 2022. Overall Math Learning Gains also increased 10% from 52% in 2021 to 62% in 2022. Science Achievement also increased 4% from 65% in 2021 to 69% in 2022.

ELL students are performing below the school average in both Math and Reading. Our ELL Aide position was increased to a full day allocation.

ESE students are also performing below the school average in Math and Reading. We have a full time ESE Assistant to offer additional support with classroom pushin. We have increased our number of ESE Support Facilitation in ELA and Math. Support Facilitators are co-teaching and planning with the classroom teachers that they support to further meet the needs of students.

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

The greatest need for improvement is in the area of ELA including Achievement, Learning Gains, and LQ Learning Gains. The data was stagnant from 2021 to 2022: Achievement of 61% remained the same, Learning Gains dropped by 1% from 53% to 52%, and LQ Learning Gains remained the same at 31%.

PM1 FAST Reading data showed 27% of 7th graders and 39% of 8th graders scoring a level 1.

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

Contributing factors to this greatest need for improvement include losing a certified Reading teacher in September of 2021 and having to fill that vacancy for the rest of the school year with a long-term substitute. The other two Reading teachers were both Out-of-Field for the 2021-22 school year.

Furthermore, the school ELL Assistant and ESE Assistant each transferred to other schools midway through the year. Those individuals provided support to student groups that needed strategic interventions in the area of Reading and ELA.

The new actions that would need to be taken to address this need for improvement would be to hire full time, in field Reading teachers and ELL and ESE assistants. Lastly, further strategic scheduling to provide for additional support facilitation by two other dual certified ESE teachers in the areas of Reading and Math.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was on the 2022 FSA Math assessments which showed a 10% increase in Math Learning Gains from 52% in 2021 to 62% in 2022. An increase in Math Lower Quartile Learning Gains was 7% from 44% in 2021 to 51% in 2022.

PM1 FAST Math progress monitoring are on pace in Math 2 and Pre-Algebra when compared to the District while Algebra I and Geometry I students are significantly above the district average. GCJ Algebra

showed 41% projected proficiency versus 23% of District students. GCJ Geometry students showed 66% projected proficiency versus 13% of District students.

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

Contributing factors to this improvement are found in the consistency of a strong math department led by the department head who facilitated weekly PLCs to common plan and create common assessments.

There is an increasing support for both ESE and ELL students in Math to provide interventions at the classroom level.

Students are offered daily opportunities to retake math assignments in our GCJ LEAD Lab. These students are sent to the LEAD Lab during an elective so as to not miss core instruction.

The 2022-23 Master Schedule was strategically built to provide some of the most struggling math students with the highest performing math teachers to bridge the gaps of their foundational math skills.

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

GCJ conducts weekly PLCs for teachers to build assessments and disaggregate data to strategically offer remediation to meet the needs of all students.

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.

Math and ELA teachers will receive professional learning on the B.E.S.T. Standards to enhance their knowledge, understanding, and use. GCJ has whole group PLC around the designing of Learning Targets and Success Criteria. Teachers also work together in weekly departmental PLC's to create lesson plans, develop assessments, and analyze data. Teachers also attend District-led Teacher Leadership Academy training to offer professional development that they facilitate at the school level to strengthen their department PLC teams.

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

GCJ will continue to increase support facilitation and co-teaching allocations across all content areas.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. 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.

Based on 2021-22 FSA Reading scores, reading continues to be an area of critical need. 7th grade ELA proficiency dropped to 59% and 8th grade remained at 63%. Lower quartile learning gains in reading remained stagnant at 31% for both 2020-21 and 2021-22, with overall learning gains in reading dropping from 53% to 52%. Overall, GCJ did not meet the projected learning targets in reading.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

The projected outcome for reading proficiency for the 2022-23 school year will be to increase overall reading proficiency to 65%, with an increase of lower quartile learning gains by 10%. This will be measured using data from the 2021-22 FSA and the 2022-23 FAST Reading assessments.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through FAST Progress Monitoring throughout the 2022-23 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Green (monica.green@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Teachers will implement writing across the curriculum using the ACE writing method to ensure that students hear common language across all classrooms to deepen understanding, articulate thinking and provide evidence to support learning. Using these strategies across the curriculum will increase student achievement in the area of reading comprehension, as teachers in all content areas will be consistently using common language to develop reading skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Teacher leaders identified reading as an area of critical need to be addressed by developing a school-wide initiative that will be implemented in all classrooms using consistent academic language, a rubric to help students identify success criteria and to prepare students to use text evidence to explain their thinking in all content areas. Teachers use this initiative to drive planning and instruction in weekly department PLC groups to assess student learning and drive instruction.

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.

Reading is the area of critical need that will be the focus for the 2022-23 school year. Teachers worked to identify this area and create a plan of action steps to increase reading comprehension. Teachers

developed a school-wide initiative plan to integrate consistent reading strategies across the curriculum. Teachers are using the ACE strategy to increase common language and strategies in all classrooms to building writing skills and use of text evidence. Teachers worked to develop a rubric to help students identify where they are in terms of mastery of using text evidence and writing or verbalizing their understanding. A monthly school-wide initiative day will show consistency across the curriculum to help reinforce the use of these reading strategies in every classroom. During weekly PLC groups, teachers will discuss student data and determine who needs remediation in this area to track progress throughout the year.

**Person
Responsible**

Monica Green (monica.green@myoneclay.net)

#2. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

| | |
|--|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | <p>Strategically build a team of teacher leaders to facilitate department PLC groups that will drive learning and instruction at GCJ. In order to increase strong instruction in all classrooms at GCJ, developing teacher leaders that can drive instruction with informed practice, mentor other teachers and facilitate PLC meetings by targeting areas of need, creating common assessments and desegregating data to meet the needs of all students.</p> |
| Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | <p>Throughout the 2022-23 school year, teacher leaders will lead weekly PLC meetings and provide detailed agendas to drive the needs of teachers and students. Teams will use the provided TACA forms to create common assessments and provide data to drive classroom instruction and identify areas of need for remediation. With the increase of teacher collaboration and common planning, the outcome will be to see data driven instruction that targets areas of need for all students. The measurable outcome will be based on FAST testing results, to increase reading proficiency to 65% and increase lower quartile gains in reading by 10%. Our goal is to show that through the continued support of teacher leaders and content area PLC groups, that we will show growth in our area of critical need.</p> |
| Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | <p>The overall progress will be monitored through FAST Progress Monitoring to track student progression with an increase in math and reading proficiency.</p> |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | <p>Monica Green (monica.green@myoneclay.net)</p> |
| Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being | <p>Developing teacher leaders to facilitate PLC communities to drive instruction, build common assessments and identify areas of need for each subject.</p> |

**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.**

In order to increase student achievement, teachers must collaborate and work together to discuss ideas and strengthen professional practice. Through professional learning communities, teachers develop unit plans, create assessments and identify areas of need to drive instruction to engage all students. District provided areas of focus assist school based leaders to align goals to ensure strategic staff development and professionally learning to drive areas of focus.

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 action steps for this area are include first continuing to coach teacher leaders to facilitate department PLC groups. Next, admin will meet weekly with teacher leaders to make sure expectations are implemented for PLC meetings and discuss student data, areas of growth and continued remediation. Lastly, admin will continue to offer book studies and coaching cycles to build capacity for leading content area PLC groups and grow instructional practice.

Person

Responsible Monica Green (monica.green@myoneclay.net)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Students and Staff**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on Climate and Culture surveys of staff and students from 2021-22, data shows that continuing to build positive relationships between teachers and students will decrease the number of low level discipline referrals and increase instructional time in all classrooms. Through school-wide PBIS initiatives to focus on positive student behaviors and interactions with teachers and staff, identified school-wide expectations will be identified and recognized to celebrate student success in all areas at GCJ.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

The measurable outcome will show data that supports that low level discipline referrals will decrease 5% throughout the school year when data is compared with the correlating month in the previous year. This data will be assessed monthly at PBIS and school-based leadership meetings.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored monthly to track data through Synergy and compare with the 2021-22 school year. School leadership will also track the amount of rewards that students receive and discuss with teachers to adjust the school-wide expectations as needed.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Demarie (james.demarie@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Developing school-wide expectations that are clearly posted in all areas that identify behavioral expectations for students reinforces boundaries and clearly outlines how they can contribute to the positive culture of GCJ. Providing strategies that help teachers develop positive relationships with students by articulating successes in all areas allows contingent and noncontingent interactions with students.

Rationale for**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

Building a positive school culture where students want to attend, feel valued and understand that they have a safe place to belong is an integral part of building a healthy community and will help students grow as learners and responsible citizens.

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 action steps for this process will be to continue working with individual teachers on building their capacity of classroom management to address specific student discipline needs. Next, continue implementation of school-wide PBIS initiative of CougarsLEAD with daily reward incentives and weekly student acknowledgement programs.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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.

GCJ has built a culture of encouraging and acknowledging positive behaviors, attitudes, and actions from students through the school-wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports system called Cougars LEAD. LEAD is an acronym that stands for Learn, Engage, Accelerate, and Deliver. Through this system, teachers, staff, and administration acknowledge and reward students for these attributes and desired student behavior with Cougar Cash, which is a school-based paper currency that students use at the Cougar Store to purchase items such as treats, fun school supplies, and GCJ swag among other items.

Additionally, two students are selected each week by their teachers as the Cougar LEAD Student of the Week. These recipients receive a certificate which includes a quote from their teacher on how they exhibit a particular Cougar LEAD attribute and is signed by the principal. This quote is read over the morning announcements and the student is presented this certificate during lunch in front of their peers where they also receive a candy bar and a gift card. We further celebrate these students with their photo on social media and the weekly internal and parent newsletters.

Furthermore, at the end of each month, all of the Cougar Cash used at the Cougar Store is put into a large box where two are selected at random. The adult name and student name on the back of those two Cougar Cash are the Cougars of the Month and have their names said over the morning announcements and receive a gift card.

Lastly, GCJ administration captures photos of strong, rigorous instruction and student engagement during weekly classroom walkthroughs which are then posted on social media and the weekly internal and parent newsletters. These photos showcase the work, effort, and creativity that teachers put into planning their lessons as well as the engagement and academic ownership of students.

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

Faculty, staff, and administration: issue Cougar Cash to students for exhibiting the Cougar LEAD attributes and desired school behaviors.

Parent Volunteer Organization (PVO): the GCJ PVO provides donations and some funding for items in the Cougar Store that students are then able to purchase with the Cougar Cash that they earn.

GCJ Administration: capturing photos of strong instruction and student engagement to showcase and celebrate on social media and in the weekly newsletters.