Gifford Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Gifford Middle School

4530 28TH CT, Vero Beach, FL 32967

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Chadwick Bacon   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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)	73%
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 (48%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (61%)
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 Indian River County School Board on 10/24/2022.

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

Gifford Middle School

4530 28TH CT, Vero Beach, FL 32967

www.indianriverschools.org

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 6-8	Yes	73%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Indian River County School Board on 10/24/2022.

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.

Gifford Middle School Will Improve Student Achievement by Providing Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships to Prepare Our Students for Future College And Careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Gifford Middle School's vision is to cultivate high achieving, college and career ready students who excel in a complex and changing world.

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
Bacon, Chadwick	Principal	
Ross, Latonya	Assistant Principal	
Blidgen, Tisa	Assistant Principal	
Ridlen, Susan	Reading Coach	
Schwenger, John	Math Coach	
Thomas, Marianne	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2022, Chadwick Bacon

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.*
2

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.*
29

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

Total number of students enrolled at the school
585

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
7

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	210	182	191	0	0	0	0	583
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	55	67	0	0	0	0	176
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	9	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	50	68	0	0	0	0	126
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	36	55	0	0	0	0	103
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	44	42	0	0	0	0	142
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	53	48	0	0	0	0	169
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	49	69	90	0	0	0	0	208

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	2	6	2	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	11

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 10/10/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of sutdents with a substantial reading deficiency		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	171	195	193	0	0	0	0	559
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	64	64	0	0	0	0	182
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	15	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	49	65	0	0	0	0	132
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	48	62	0	0	0	0	129
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	46	51	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	54	44	0	0	0	0	155
Number of sutdents with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	46	51	0	0	0	0	141

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	67	65	0	0	0	0	173

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	9	7	12	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	15

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	44%	48%	50%				52%	54%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	46%						55%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						44%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	39%	33%	36%				54%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	39%						50%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						36%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	51%	53%				48%	53%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	53%	58%				69%	72%	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	47%	52%	-5%	54%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	55%	51%	4%	52%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
08	2022					
	2019	55%	53%	2%	56%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	50%	53%	-3%	55%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	41%	53%	-12%	54%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
08	2022					
	2019	30%	47%	-17%	46%	-16%
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	46%	49%	-3%	48%	-2%
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	67%	69%	-2%	71%	-4%
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	95%	58%	37%	61%	34%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	94%	53%	41%	57%	37%

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	13	35	35	16	39	44	24	35			
ELL	20	40	43	32	46	33	17	45			
BLK	22	32	38	19	39	52	22	50	67		
HSP	38	51	41	44	40	25	33	65	56		
MUL	50	50		28	25						
WHT	64	55	32	53	39	63	83	86	67		
FRL	33	41	39	29	38	48	35	58	54		
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	13	29	27	19	31	30	18	51			
ELL	27	39	39	27	31	28	13	67	18		
BLK	23	28	20	20	26	25	23	38	33		
HSP	40	38	40	45	41	43	33	74	41		
MUL	50	54		53	58						
WHT	65	62	50	68	57	57	69	84	74		
FRL	30	34	21	31	34	32	30	55	40		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	38	33	27	36	27	28	36	50		
ELL	36	53	53	51	60	60		60			
BLK	28	46	40	30	38	31	15	45	58		
HSP	53	57	59	50	50	42	38	76	75		
MUL	72	76		42	37						
WHT	69	60	43	74	59	44	75	81	81		
FRL	37	50	45	36	43	33	28	57	57		

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	48

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	434
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	35
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	
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	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
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	38
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	42
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?

Gifford Middle School Math and ELA achievement has been declining for the past three years
18-19 Math 54% ELA 52%
20-21 Math 46% ELA 45%
21-22 Math 39% ELA 44%

The ESSA subgroups that fell below 41% threshold were Black 38%, Multiracial 38%, Students with Disabilities 30%, and English Language Learners 35%.

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

The beginning of the year FAST assessment indicated ELA achievement at 26% and Math achievement at 8%.

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

Behavior and attendance concerns attributed to some of the achievement scores. The school has adopted new behavior and attendance policies and procedures. Administration meets weekly to discuss behavior, attendance, and academic achievement progress monitoring data.

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

Science achievement for 8th grade was at 50% and was an increase from 44% in the previous year. Civics achievement for 7th grade was at 67% and maintained that score from the previous year. These two content areas were the highest areas of achievement for Gifford Middle School.

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

The teachers in Science and Civics have significant knowledge of the content and standards. These teachers use high yield strategies to support student acquisition of knowledge.

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

To accelerate learning at Gifford Middle School, administration created a progressive discipline plan that decreases that lack of follow through and supports student and teacher needs. Students were being sent to the office for dress code violations which caused them miss instruction. Dress code policies were updated to allow for more flexibility on what students can wear to school without causing a distraction. Cell phones being used during class was inhibiting students from learning. Cell phones are no longer allowed to be visible in class and this policy is being strictly enforced. Gifford Middle School has hired two security guards to ensure students are in class. PBIS has been fully implemented in every classroom and school wide incentives have been established.

To improve tier one instruction, Gifford Middle School has implemented a more focused collaborative planning structure. Administration and instructional coaches attend collaborative planning through an established schedule and location. A collaborative planning protocol is used to guide lesson plan development and discussion towards standards based instruction using high yield strategies.

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.

The school year started with a "State of the School" training for all staff members on last year's strengths and weaknesses. Administration set expectations for school year and discussed the new cell phone policy, dress code policy, roll of security guards, progressive discipline policy, collaborative planning expectations, and PBIS plan.

Professional development is also held during collaborative planning focused on standards based instruction using high yield strategies, behavior management, and progress monitoring achievement data.

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

Afterschool tutoring will be held to support students in need of remediation in ELA, Math, and Science.

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 Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Collaborative planning was identified as a critical need area to support implementation of the new BEST ELA and Math standards. Collaborative planning will provide a structured time for teachers to review the new BEST standards and resources to develop similar lessons that are student centered and focused on standards mastery. During collaborative planning, teachers plan engagement strategies and formative assessments that meet the daily learning target.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By implementing collaborative planning measures, administration will see similar lessons and tasks being implemented within the same content or grade level based on Walkthrough data of 80% evident. Gifford Middle School baseline data for Walkthroughs Collaborative Planning: 60% Engagement: 38% Standards Based Instruction: 56% Formative Assessment: 21%
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Gifford Middle School will use the district created Power Bi dashboard to track Walkthrough trends and student achievement progress. Data and feedback will be shared out during collaborative planning sessions. The leadership team will make adjustments to levels of support for teachers and students as needed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The evidence based strategy of Planning and Prediction has an effect size of .76 based on John Hattie's research.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	If teachers use BEST standards resources and core curriculum, teachers will develop lesson plans that have similar lessons and tasks.

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.

Develop collaborative planning protocol, schedule, and common location

Person Responsible   Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

Administration and instructional coaches attend collaborative planning to support implementation of protocol and expectations

Person Responsible   Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

Administration will conduct fidelity walkthroughs to track trends and provide feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible   Chadwick Bacon (chadwick.bacon@indianriverschools.org)

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.

Data Findings: Addressing the lack of follow through with relation to 3-3-3 progressive discipline plan.

Rationale for Selection of Data: 78% of teacher feedback surveys indicated that the 3-3-3 systems was broken and needs to be changed.

High Yield Strategy:
1. Listen and Lean
1.1. We listened to the feedback and are adjusting based on teacher and student data received for the 3-3-3

Goal: Create a progressive 3-2-1 approach (3 Lunch Detentions, 2 Wednesday Detentions, 1 Friday Detention) that decreases a lack of follow through and results in at least 80% (36 of 45) of teachers feeling supported as outlined on the End of Year Climate Survey. Incremental increases of 25% per quarter in the positive feedback as based on the Teacher Feedback Surveys

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

(Principal, Assistant Principals, Success Coach, ASPIRE, Coordinator)
1. Design a new dress code policy and share with all stakeholders.
2. Design a new Cell Phone "Threshold Policy" and share with all stakeholders.
3. Design a new Restroom Procedure complete with tracking and designated vicinity's and share with all stakeholders.
4. Design a new 3-2-1 discipline policy to revamp the existing 3-3-3 progressive discipline policy and share with all stakeholders.

(Principal, Assistant Principals, and Success Coach)
5. Deliver to teachers to support the process of implementing the new initiatives.
6. Monitor for Implementation of the new policies and collect raw data that reflects the extent of

implementation as related to action items 1-4 outlined above.
7. Examine data collected, reflect on barriers, and adjust accordingly to push towards desired results.

(Principal, Assistant Principals, Success Coach, and Teachers)
8. Re-Implement the process with changes necessary based on data input for those areas not meeting desired results and provide necessary support mechanisms to address barriers.

(Principal, Assistant Principals, and Success Coach)
9. Repeat steps 6-7-8 and continue cycle until desired outcome is achieved and then continue to monitor and support implementation to ensure sustainability.