R J Murray Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

R J Murray Middle School

150 N HOLMES BLVD, St Augustine, FL 32084

http://www-mms.stjohns.k12.fl.us/

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 RJMMS community will work as One Team to ensure there are No Limits to our students reaching their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The purpose of R.J. Murray Middle School is to prepare students for high school and post-secondary opportunities. Our school's focus on College Readiness is to create awareness of post-secondary opportunities for all students through our programs of study in the arts and academics. The goals of the MMS College Readiness program are outlined as follows:
-Improve academic preparedness and performance of students at Murray Middle School for post-secondary education.
-Increase high school graduation rates and promote student enrollment in institutions of higher learning.
-Increase awareness and participation among students and parents in programs and activities that support an understanding of post-secondary enrollment requirements, funding options, and opportunities.
-Increase scholarship opportunities for the high school graduates, as supported by collaborations with the local colleges, city and community agencies, and school district.
-Align school-wide instruction at R.J. Murray Middle School to college entrance expectations for students in middle grades.
-Align all college readiness initiatives into one school-wide initiative to prepare all students attending R.J. Murray Middle for post-secondary instruction and the workforce.

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
Seward, Esther	Principal	Duties typically seen by a principal.
Cofield, Chris	Assistant Principal	Duties typically seen by an assistant principal.
Smith, Holly	Assistant Principal	Duties typically seen by an assistant principal.
Lucien, Hannah	Instructional Coach	Duties typically seen by an Instructional Literacy Coach.
James, Brandon	Dean	Duties typically seen by a dean of students.
Brailsford, Dawn	Other	Duties typically seen by a testing coordinator.
Berry, Natashia	Dean	Duties typically seen by a dean of students.

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.

During the summer and preplanning, the school principal met with stakeholders (including teachers, parents, school staff members, the school leadership team, community leaders, and business partners). The input each stakeholder group provided was used in the development of the SIP.

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 monitored a minimum of three times during the school year (after each F.A.S.T. assessment). The school leadership teams will analyze F.A.S.T. data and the implement a plan for increasing student achievement for each assessment period. The SIP will be revised, if necessary to ensure continuous improvement of all students, with a targeted focus on Students with Disabilities.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	38%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	81%
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: B
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	70	69	70	209
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	70	59	201
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	21	12	62
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	64	62	182
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	66	73	68	207

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	0	0	16	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	19	27	28	74
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	56	53	170
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	19	17	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	19	17	51
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	32	30	90
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	64	60	173
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	32	30	88

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	48	58	63	169

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	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	19	27	28	74
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	56	53	170
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	19	17	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	19	17	51
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	32	30	90
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	64	60	173
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	32	30	88

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	48	58	63	169

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	16	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	58	71	49	49	67	50	50		
ELA Learning Gains				43			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			28		
Math Achievement*	58	79	56	53	37	36	50		
Math Learning Gains				50			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			35		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	60	73	49	50	75	53	47		
Social Studies Achievement*	55	87	68	70	65	58	62		
Middle School Acceleration	68	68	73	77	51	49	75		
Graduation Rate					70	49			
College and Career Acceleration					90	70			
ELP Progress		49	40		71	76			

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](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	299
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	478
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
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	22	Yes	4	2
ELL	19	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	40	Yes	4	
HSP	64			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	46			

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	26	Yes	3	1
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	3	
HSP	68			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	42			

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	58			58			60	55	68			
SWD	25			22			19				3	
ELL	23			15							2	
AMI												
ASN	90			70							2	
BLK	34			33			25		67		4	
HSP	62			65			65		65		4	
MUL	69			69			85		64		4	
PAC												
WHT	64			63			66		69		4	
FRL	44			44			45		52		4	

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	49	43	34	53	50	52	50	70	77			
SWD	10	28	29	16	38	43	13	34				
ELL	45			30								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22	32	30	22	35	41	19	50	50			
HSP	61	59	69	68	63	87	57	71	76			
MUL	58	45		71	71		73	90				
PAC												
WHT	56	45	33	61	53	55	60	76	79			
FRL	30	34	34	36	44	51	31	58	58			

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	50	46	28	50	40	35	47	62	75			
SWD	11	24	23	14	27	31	14	24				
ELL												

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**
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	33	25	22	23	29	18	36	64			
HSP	53	54	36	46	37	21	47	75	67			
MUL	69	48		62	42							
PAC												
WHT	57	48	27	60	47	44	56	70	77			
FRL	32	35	25	33	32	32	35	44	59			

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	55%	69%	-14%	47%	8%
08	2023 - Spring	59%	69%	-10%	47%	12%
09	2023 - Spring	*	70%	*	48%	*
06	2023 - Spring	60%	70%	-10%	47%	13%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2023 - Spring	65%	81%	-16%	54%	11%
07	2023 - Spring	37%	66%	-29%	48%	-11%
08	2023 - Spring	59%	81%	-22%	55%	4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2023 - Spring	58%	71%	-13%	44%	14%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	78%	13%	50%	41%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	67%	28%	48%	47%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	86%	10%	63%	33%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	62%	85%	-23%	66%	-4%

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.

SWD and Black/African American students showed the lowest performance in ELA achievement. Attendance was a contributing factor.

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

Black/African American Students showed the greatest decline in ELA achievement. Attendance was a contributing factor.

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.

SWD had the greatest gap in ELA achievement when compared to the state average. Attendance was a contributing factor.

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

Hispanic subgroup showed the most improvement in ELA achievement and learning gains; as well as math achievement and math gains. In this subgroup, the bottom quartile also showed the most improvement in ELA and math learning gains. Actions we took in this area consisted of weekly ELL support during school, as well as weekly after school tutoring.

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

Overall achievement for Students with Disabilities subgroup in ELA and math.
Overall achievement for Black/African American subgroup in ELA and math.

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

Students with Disabilities subgroup
Black/African American subgroup
FRL/Economically Disadvantage subgroup

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 Professional Learning Communities

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.

Since June 2019, we have worked and grown as a PLC school. For the last two school years, we built our master schedule around PLC teams collaborative planning time with our Exceptional Student Education department. This allows our general education teachers and our ESE teachers the time necessary to collaborate as a team and reach our instructional goals.

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

PLC teams meet weekly and analyze data to drive and inform instruction regarding remediation, enrichment, and acceleration.

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

Instructional practices will be monitored utilizing administrator observations, PLC OneNote, GradeCam, and F.A.S.T. assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Esther Seward (esther.seward@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Goddard defines collective efficacy as, "the perceptions of teachers in a school that the faculty as a whole can organize and execute the courses of action required to have a positive effect on students" (Goddard, 2003). Hattie submits "Collective Teacher Efficacy" is the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students. The research of Goddard and Hattie cite collective teacher efficacy and collaboration a having a strong effect size and effect on student achievement.

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

The PLC process is the main strategy we utilize schoolwide to address and improve student achievement. With utilization and implementation of collaborative structures in all content areas, we will reach our instructional goals.

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.

1. Build the master schedule to allow time for PLC teams to plan together.
2. Provide PLC training and support.
3. Provide Kagan training for all instructional staff throughout the year utilizing Wednesday PD time.

4. Provide one PLC planning day per quarter with district curriculum specialist and the instructional literacy coach.

Person Responsible: Esther Seward (esther.seward@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 30, 2024

#2. 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.

Student behavior is a contributing factor to a positive learning environment. As we improve student behavior, we decrease negative consequences and time spent out of the classroom. Positive student behavior becomes a contributing factor to teacher retention and a positive school culture. We utilize school-wide PBIS to improve student behavior and the culture of our school.

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

We will utilize Class Dojo to track and reward student behavior on a school-wide level.

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

Student discipline data
Class Dojo points
Classroom PBIS
School-wide PBIS events

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Smith (holly.smith@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Our PBIS team will implement a school-wide PBIS program and system utilizing Class Dojo.

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

Student behavior is a contributing factor to a positive learning environment. As we improve student behavior, we decrease negative consequences and time spent out of the classroom. Positive student behavior becomes a contributing factor to teacher retention and a positive school culture. We utilize school-wide PBIS to improve student behavior and the culture of our 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.

1. Create PBIS team.
2. Have team attend PBIS training during the summer of 2023.
3. PBIS team will present and train staff on Class Dojo during preplanning.
4. PBIS team meets regularly to plan events and analyze schoolwide data.
5. Discipline team meets regularly to analyze schoolwide discipline data.

6. Provide professional development to staff regarding social emotional learning, classroom management, and student engagement.

Person Responsible: Holly Smith (holly.smith@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 30, 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.

Historical data from 2018-2022 indicates Students with Disabilities were the lowest performing subgroup with less than 20% proficient in ELA and math.

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

The gap between our subgroups and our school-wide average meeting proficiency will simultaneously increase and narrow by 5% as demonstrated by classroom grades and state exams.

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

PLC Data
Classroom Grades - quarterly and semester
F.A.S.T. Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chris Cofield (christopher.cofield@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.)

1. Identify students in the subgroup
2. Create master schedule allowing for maximum support facilitation in ELA and math course
3. Provide ongoing professional development focusing on instructional strategies for students with disabilities
4. PLC teams will track and use data to inform instructional practices

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

Goddard defines collective efficacy as, "the perceptions of teachers in a school that the faculty as a whole can organize and execute the courses of action required to have a positive effect on students" (Goddard, 2003). Hattie submits "Collective Teacher Efficacy" is the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students. The research of Goddard and Hattie cite collective teacher efficacy and collaboration a having a strong effect size and affect on student achievement.

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.

1. Identify students in the subgroup.
2. Create master schedule allowing for maximum support facilitation in ELA and math courses.
3. Provide ongoing professional development focusing on instructional strategies for students with

disabilities.

4. PLC teams will track and use data to inform instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Esther Seward (esther.seward@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 30, 2024

#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.

A positive school culture and environment is reflective of the learning conditions that meet the needs of all students. Additionally, a positive school environment creates a culture built on caring, high expectations, values respect, and is built on trust. Collaboration and consultation with various stakeholder groups is imperative and critical in formulating a positive culture and environment.

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

All faculty and staff will promote a positive school culture and environment.

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

The SAC survey
Attendance and participation in school-wide PBIS events
Attendance and participation in school events on and off campus

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Smith (holly.smith@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Goddard defines collective efficacy as, "the perceptions of teachers in a school that the faculty as a whole can organize and execute the courses of action required to have a positive effect on students" (Goddard, 2003). Hattie submits "Collective Teacher Efficacy" is the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students. The research of Goddard and Hattie cite collective teacher efficacy and collaboration a having a strong effect size and affect on student achievement.

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

A positive school culture and environment is reflective of the learning conditions that meet the needs of all students. Additionally, a positive school environment creates a culture built on caring, high expectations, values respect, and is built on trust. Collaboration and consultation with various stakeholder groups is imperative and critical in formulating a positive culture and environment.

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.

1. During the summer and preplanning, the school principal met with stakeholders (including teachers, parents, school staff members, the school leadership team, community leaders, and business partners).
2. Parents will receive a weekly "Bulldog Bulletin" email from the principal with an abundance of

information to stay informed and ways for them to be part of our decision-making process.
3. Year-round, parents will be invited to join multiple parent organizations (PTO, SAC, SJCCA Boosters).
4. Year-round, parents will be invited to attend and participate in multiple events (Family engagement events, during school and after school events, honor and character counts celebrations, etc.).

Person Responsible: Esther Seward (esther.seward@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 30, 2024

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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.

Historical data from 2019-2022 indicates Black/African American students were the second lowest performing subgroup. Black/African American students declined 11% in proficiency in ELA and 8% in proficiency math.

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

The gap between our subgroups and our school-wide average meeting proficiency will simultaneously increase and narrow by 5% as demonstrated by classroom grades and state exams.

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

PLC Data
Classroom Grades - quarterly and semester
F.A.S.T. Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Esther Seward (esther.seward@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.)

1. Identify students in the subgroup.
2. Create master schedule allowing for maximum support facilitation in ELA and math courses.
3. Provide ongoing professional development focusing on instructional strategies for students with disabilities.
4. PLC teams will track and use data to inform instructional practices.

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

Goddard defines collective efficacy as, "the perceptions of teachers in a school that the faculty as a whole can organize and execute the courses of action required to have a positive effect on students" (Goddard, 2003). Hattie submits "Collective Teacher Efficacy" is the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students. The research of Goddard and Hattie cite collective teacher efficacy and collaboration a having a strong effect size and affect on student achievement.

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.

1. Identify students in the subgroup.
2. Create master schedule allowing for maximum support facilitation in ELA and math courses.

3. Provide ongoing professional development focusing on instructional strategies for students with disabilities.

4. PLC teams will track and use data to inform instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Esther Seward (esther.seward@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 30, 2024

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

Historical data from 2018-2022 indicate only one year of data for the ELL subgroup. For the 2022 year, 45% of the subgroup was proficient in ELA while 30% was proficient in math.

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

The gap between our subgroups and our school-wide average meeting proficiency in math will simultaneously increase and narrow by 5% as demonstrated by classroom grades and state exams.

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

PLC Data
Classroom Grades - quarterly and semester
F.A.S.T. Assessments

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.)

1. Identify students in the subgroup
2. Create master schedule allowing for maximum support facilitation in math courses.
3. Provide ongoing professional development focusing on instructional strategies for students with disabilities
4. PLC teams will track and use data to inform instructional practices.

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

Goddard defines collective efficacy as, "the perceptions of teachers in a school that the faculty as a whole can organize and execute the courses of action required to have a positive effect on students" (Goddard, 2003). Hattie submits "Collective Teacher Efficacy" is the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students. The research of Goddard and Hattie cite collective teacher efficacy and collaboration a having a strong effect size and affect on student achievement.

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.

1. Identify students in the subgroup
2. Create master schedule allowing for maximum support facilitation in math courses.
3. Provide ongoing professional development focusing on instructional strategies for students with

disabilities

4. PLC teams will track and use data to inform instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Esther Seward (esther.seward@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 30, 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).

Monthly, administration will review the school improvement funding allocations to ensure resources are allocated based on need, researched based, on the district approved curriculum/resources list, and aligned to state standards. Additionally, school improvement funding allocated for after school tutoring will also be reviewed with district office and school administration personnel twice in the first semester to ensure resources are allocated based on need.

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.

The SIP will be made publicly available via the RJ Murray Middle School's website. Additionally, the SIP will be disseminated at a School Advisory Committee meeting and at a Title I Family Engagement event during the course of the 2023-24 school year.

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))

1. Upon registration, parents will be made aware of the Home Access Center (HAC) and how to log in to retrieve information on their child's progress.
2. Parents will receive a weekly "Bulldog Bulletin" email from the principal with an abundance of information to stay informed and ways for them to be part of our decision-making process.
3. The school's Family Engagement Plan will be made publicly via the RJ Murray Middle School's website.
4. Year-round, parents will be invited to join multiple parent organizations (PTO, SAC, SJCCA Boosters).
5. We will use our SAC survey results to create goals for the upcoming school year.

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))

In alignment with our school mission, we will offer a "One Team After School Tutoring Program." The tutoring program will be offered four days a week and will provide students with remediation opportunities, enrichment lessons, and test preparation. Students with Disabilities performing below grade level will be identified and invited to attend. We will offer free bus transportation for students zoned to attend RJ Murray Middle School.

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