Forest Grove Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Forest Grove Middle School

3201 S 25TH ST, Fort Pierce, FL 34981

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/10/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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.
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 Science, Social Studies 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.
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.
Siminski, Jamie	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, Mr. Siminski oversees teacher certification and all events that occur on and off campus.
Nichols, Sumer	Administrative Support	The TSA (Teacher on Special Assignment) serves as an instructional leader school-wide, supervising some operations and supporting teachers for identified areas of the school environment. The TSA focus will support new teachers in NEST program. The TSA role also entails overseeing some compliance with district policies, success of instructional programs, and operation of all school -based activities.
Nicholas, Natasha	Math Coach	The instructional coach (Nicholas) 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. Nicholas will assist in spearheading instructional professional development trainings based on improving areas of concern within classroom instruction.

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

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

Our School Advisory Council meetings will be one of the ways we will discuss, and share information concerning Forest Gove Middle School and ask for input from all stakeholders in attendance during those monthly meetings along with sharing the outcomes. During our weekly school leadership meetings, we will monitor our SIP plan and make changes if necessary. Monthly teacher/staff meetings, CLP, Early Release trainings, and the school Bulldog Bulletin will be used to share school goals and interventions identified in the SIP. Discuss and share the monitoring process and if we are meeting the school SIP goals.

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

The SIP will be regularly monitored every nine-week period. Using data from classroom observations/ walkthroughs, checks for understanding (discussing during CLP) unit assessments, PM1, and PM2 will help the leadership team monitor the effectiveness of the SIP. Keeping data as the driving force for academic decisions and sharing this information with teachers/staff during early release trainings, faculty meetings, and CLP.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	84%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	84%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	176	143	406
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	95	82	215
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	19	47
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	17	40
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	113	257
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	107	233
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	115	101	334

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	201	156	414

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	141	132	408
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	68	56	192
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	6	1	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	8	2	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	102	103	298
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	103	95	303
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	155	126	110	391

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	155	144	147	446

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	141	132	408
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	68	56	192
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	6	1	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	8	2	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	102	103	298
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	103	95	303
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	155	126	110	391

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	155	144	147	446

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	35	36	49	43	39	50	42		
ELA Learning Gains				46			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			33		
Math Achievement*	35	37	56	41	37	36	34		
Math Learning Gains				59			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			48		
Science Achievement*	34	32	49	35	39	53	34		
Social Studies Achievement*	57	50	68	56	52	58	49		
Middle School Acceleration	80	74	73	85	48	49	75		
Graduation Rate					39	49			
College and Career Acceleration					53	70			
ELP Progress	20	23	40	39	79	76	36		

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	261
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	503
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	16	Yes	4	2
ELL	33	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	40	Yes	1	
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	68			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	41			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	3	1
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	51			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	35			35			34	57	80			20
SWD	8			13			21	33			5	4
ELL	18			25			14	43	77		6	20
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25			24			26	44	75		6	22
HSP	32			33			31	54	70		6	19
MUL	56			56				75			3	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	59			58			53	79	89		5	
FRL	31			31			31	52	78		6	20

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	43	46	35	41	59	64	35	56	85			39
SWD	19	35	30	24	49	47	12	24				35
ELL	35	46	42	35	57	63	26	53	72			39
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	41	31	25	55	61	21	41	88			41
HSP	44	48	41	43	58	68	34	60	75			38
MUL	67	50		61	64							
PAC												
WHT	63	47	33	67	70	72	60	76	93			
FRL	39	44	31	38	58	64	31	52	86			39

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	42	45	33	34	42	48	34	49	75			36
SWD	19	31	20	20	44	45	9	29				40
ELL	28	41	37	28	45	52	15	51	67			36
AMI												
ASN	70	60		60	50							
BLK	26	38	30	18	33	42	20	39	43			34
HSP	46	46	36	39	48	53	34	54	76			37
MUL	67	56		39	44							
PAC												
WHT	62	53	33	57	46	55	66	60	88			
FRL	39	43	33	31	42	48	32	46	74			37

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	34%	43%	-9%	47%	-13%
08	2023 - Spring	37%	43%	-6%	47%	-10%
06	2023 - Spring	28%	42%	-14%	47%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	24%	48%	-24%	54%	-30%
07	2023 - Spring	20%	38%	-18%	48%	-28%
08	2023 - Spring	38%	43%	-5%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	33%	41%	-8%	44%	-11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	34%	49%	50%	33%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	39%	59%	48%	50%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	53%	61%	-8%	66%	-13%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data components that showed the lowest performance was ELA and science at 33% proficiency. This was a 10-point decrease in ELA and 2-point decrease in science. Some contributing factors were teachers learning the new B.E.S.T. standards and using the district approved curriculum. There were also many vacancies with long term substitute teachers in ELA & science. Many of our students do not have the foundational skills in reading which will affect their comprehension skills.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was ELA with 33% proficiency. This was a 10-point decrease from previous year. Many of our students do not have the necessary foundational skills in reading. There were many vacancies with long term substitute teachers in ELA. This was the first year with the B.E.S.T. standards and teachers learning them.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data components that had the greatest gap compared to the state average was both reading and math.

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

The data component that did not decrease or increase compared to the previous year was the middle school acceleration. The previous year we had 85% proficiency, and we were able to maintain the 85% proficiency.

Some of the new actions we took was being strategic with scheduling students in the acceleration math courses. Teachers provided before and after school tutoring to the students. Math CLPs that focus on planning, instructional delivery to the Math B.E.S.T. standards, checking for understanding, unit assessments, and discussing the results from CFU/unit assessments. Teachers provided small group instruction. Math Coach and Math Interventionist provided push-in and pull-out interventions.

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

Looking at the EWS data one of the areas of concern is the number of students that were absent ten percent or more during the school year. The other area of concern number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.

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

#1 ELA
#2 Math
#3 Science proficiency
#4 Building teacher capacity
#5 Attendance (students & teachers)

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to our data progress monitoring data ELA proficiency did not improve and decreased by 10 points. By focusing on this area, it not only supports 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 45 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 Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

small group instruction
office of teaching and learning supplemental materials
Reading interventionist support
Critical Thinking Comprehension Support

Person Responsible: Katina Barriner (katina.barriner@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Ongoing progress monitoring throughout the school year May 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

Math proficiency decreased by 8 points compared to previous year. There will continue to be a focus on increasing proficiency however, we know that learning gains will count this year. A focus will be on students that we can move to proficiency, and we will do this by increasing 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 into a double block of mathematics. The first block will utilize the district approved curriculum and curriculum guide for instruction. The second block will focus 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 Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 one conferencing. The math coach will support the teachers through small group pullout/ push-in. The math coach will support teachers with small group planning and conduct coaching cycles.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Level 1 students will have multiple opportunities to increase math performance and receive a tiered approach to improving math fluency. Level 2 students will have multiple opportunities to increase math performance by being proficient.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Math Coach support CLP
Level 1 student's double blocked in Math
Math Coach support classrooms with tier 3 students
Small group pullout/push-in

Person Responsible: Natasha Nicholas (natasha.nicolas@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Ongoing progress monitoring throughout the school year May 2024

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Analysis of student achievement subgroup data indicates students with disabilities are not achieving at the same rate as their non-disabled peers in reading. This subgroup has been below 41% for three consecutive years.

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

The percentage of students with disabilities demonstrating learning gains in ELA will increase by 25%, based on FAST Progress Monitoring data.

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

B.E.S.T. standards will be monitored through data from FAST progress monitoring and unit assessments. Areas of need will be retaught to improve proficiency within the standards of concern. Student progress will be monitored based on Progress Monitoring Data and unit assessment growth with assessments of similar standard types.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Both classroom and support teachers will provide standards-based differentiated instruction to meet the need of students with disabilities. This strategy can be used in both whole group and smal group instruction to support learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiated instruction allows teachers to meet the needs of all students and especially SWDs to improve learning outcomes. SAVVAS and Really Great Reading supplemental materials have components to increase both fluency and comprehension and is a strategy that benefits all students and will assist in improving reading proficiency trough meeting diverse needs of students.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Teachers will be trained in Really Great Reading Supplemental Materials in October/ November of 2023

Person Responsible: Katina Barriner (katina.barriner@stlucieschools.org)

By When: ongoing progress monitoring throughout the year in May 2023.

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

Implementing a positive school culture and environment for all stakeholders (students, teachers, and parents) will create and engaging learning environment that students will come to school every day ready to learn, there will be less to no teacher turnover, and you can continue to build capacity, and parents being fully invested if they see that students are happy, and teachers are more invested in their students learning.

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

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.

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

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

We will monitor students by tracking attendance daily and monthly, tracking the number of positive referrals monthly using an excel spreadsheet, and student referrals. We will be tracking the number of positive referrals a teacher gives vs. the number of negative referrals/BIRS given monthly.

We will monitor teachers by tracking attendance, teacher shout-outs given in the school bulletin, monthly incentives given and why, and track the numbers of teachers retained compared to the number that was not retained and why.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Keonisha Bobo (keonisha.bobo@stlucieschools.org)

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

For students we will use 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 an issue or concern arrives.

For teachers and 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 serve. Also, continue to build the capacity of the teachers retained by giving them any support they need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies will help promote a positive school culture by improving student attendance, academic achievement, and referrals for the students. These strategies will promote a positive school culture by retaining teachers which helps with stability of a school and only having to recruit in low numbers due to teachers staying at Forest Grove Middle School.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Track student attendance & monthly AIT meetings (Attendance Intervention Team)
PBIS (bulldog bucks & events)
Positive Behavior referrals vs. Negative Behavior referrals monthly
Teacher attendance
Teacher retention vs teacher non-return
Teacher recognition
Teacher incentives.

Person Responsible: DaShan Person (dashan.person@stlucieschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year May 2024

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

Title 1 funding is shared with all stakeholders via Title 1 parent nights, monthly School Advisory Council meetings, and faculty meetings. Title 1 funding was allocated for teachers, graduation coach, and purchase of resources to support teachers and students. Title 1 parent nights are essential for disseminating information on strategies parents can use to support their student(s) in reading and math.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

N/A

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

N/A

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
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. §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?

N/A

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

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

N/A

Title I Requirements

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

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

https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/fgm/

The schoolwide SIP will be disseminated on our school website for access to all stakeholders. The SIP will be shared and discussed during faculty meetings and early release trainings. The initial SIP will be shared with parents and community members during our monthly SAC meetings. As we are progress monitoring and if changes are being made to the SIP that information will be shared.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/fgm/

Creating a warm and welcoming environment when parents, families, and other stakeholders enter the school. Inform all stakeholders of opportunities where and when they could volunteer within the school, come speak to students about skills, trades, and/or opportunities within the community. Invite community agencies to support our students/families in need.

We will keep parents informed of their student progress by having student led conference night, parent/teacher/student conferences, encouraging parents to get a parent skyward account, letters home, phone calls home. School webpage and social media.

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

We plan to strengthen the academic program in school is by using CLPs to plan bell-to-bell instruction. Looking at the FAST PM1, PM2, and unit assessments data to drive instruction and decisions within the school and classrooms. Provide opportunities for our proficient students in more project-based activities to keep them engaged and proficient. we utilize small group instruction and monitor the data of those students.

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

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

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

The school has two guidance counselors that meet with students individually or in small group counseling sessions. They visit classrooms and conduct lessons on various age- appropriate lessons. The school also provides wrap around services for students that are provided at the school.

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

We make our parents aware of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce by sharing with parents during School Advisory Council meetings. This year we want to have a CET fair for our 7th and 8th graders so they can be aware of all the programs available within St. Lucie County Schools.

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

Schoolwide we have the BARK expectations posted throughout the school and in classrooms. These BARK expectations are shared daily on the morning announcements. We utilize our PBIS plan schoolwide. monthly data is collected with BIRS and referrals to put interventions in place for students.

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

We assess professional development needs via teacher/staff surveys, classroom walkthroughs, and student data from district and state assessments. Teachers are provided classroom support and coaching cycles from the instructional coaches in the building. Some of the early release days are used for professional development. We encourage teachers to enroll in district trainings as well.

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

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | $0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | $0.00 |

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No