

Clay County Schools

Green Cove Springs Junior High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Green Cove Springs Junior High School

1220 BONAVENTURE AVE, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://gcj.oneclay.net>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Clay County School Board on 10/5/2023.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

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

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.

SIP development includes all members of the leadership team, including students, parents and community leaders. Regular meetings will be held to assess data and discuss strategies to improve topics such as attendance, academic instruction, community involvement and continuing to improve the school culture at GCJ.

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))

SIP will monitored regularly based on PM and FAST data to track student progress, weekly PLC meetings with departments to ensure standards are being taught with fidelity and the analyze student data with teachers to ensure that achievement gaps are being targeted through differentiated instruction. Monthly whole group PLC sessions will ensure that teachers are receiving training provide students with quality instruction and understand how to create lessons based on standards that include learning targets, success criteria and aligned tasks to ensure that students can track their progress toward mastery of standards.

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 7-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	40%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	41%
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)* Asian Students (ASN) 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: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	0	99	120	219
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	37	63
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	32	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	37	71
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	43	79	122

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	0	45	60	105

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	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	97	103	200
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	73	147
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	61	126
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	76	86	162

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	0	68	69	137

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

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	0	97	103	200
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	73	147
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	61	126
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	76	86	162

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	0	68	69	137

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

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*	59	54	49	61	56	50	61		
ELA Learning Gains				52			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31			31		
Math Achievement*	75	69	56	67	33	36	64		
Math Learning Gains				62			52		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			44		
Science Achievement*	67	62	49	69	64	53	65		
Social Studies Achievement*	83	81	68	79	59	58	80		
Middle School Acceleration	75	63	73	73	46	49	79		
Graduation Rate					63	49			
College and Career Acceleration					81	70			
ELP Progress	38	44	40	27	67	76	27		

* 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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	397
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	572
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	48			
ELL	35	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	96			
BLK	59			
HSP	58			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	58			

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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	93			
BLK	49			
HSP	53			

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%
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	51			

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	59			75			67	83	75			38
SWD	32			47			39	64	57		5	
ELL	13			47			38	40			5	38
AMI												
ASN	83			100			100	100	95		5	
BLK	46			59			57	72	62		5	
HSP	50			64			48	71	58		5	
MUL	51			72			63	91	75		5	
PAC												
WHT	64			80			73	87	77		5	
FRL	45			62			49	74	61		5	

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	61	52	31	67	62	51	69	79	73			27
SWD	23	32	23	32	42	45	33	52	74			
ELL	21	41	26	52	59	29	25	44				27
AMI												
ASN	84	88		100	86		91	100	100			

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
BLK	40	41	21	43	58	58	43	71	70			
HSP	53	50	33	58	55	42	62	71	77			27
MUL	69	50		62	61		73	80	69			
PAC												
WHT	65	52	34	73	63	45	76	81	71			
FRL	47	45	29	51	57	46	50	70	66			

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	61	53	31	64	52	44	65	80	79			27
SWD	18	27	22	23	29	28	29	52	52			
ELL	20	29	18	25	42	43	17	55				27
AMI												
ASN	82	68		82	68		71	90	81			
BLK	41	35	18	39	23	25	37	51	81			
HSP	54	51	28	55	50	37	59	72	71			
MUL	68	65		58	33		67		85			
PAC												
WHT	64	55	37	70	58	55	71	86	80			
FRL	43	45	33	45	49	44	47	65	55			

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	61%	52%	9%	47%	14%
08	2023 - Spring	53%	51%	2%	47%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	62%	50%	12%	48%	14%
08	2023 - Spring	72%	70%	2%	55%	17%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	68%	29%	50%	47%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	53%	43%	48%	48%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	73%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	79%	3%	66%	16%

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.

Based on the most recent state assessment data, ELA proficiency dropped to 58% proficiency, with 7th grade ELA increasing proficiency to 61%, 8th grade ELA dropped to 54% proficiency. Students in both grade levels showed growth, but the overall proficiency level for 8th grade dropped. With a two year comparison, that group of students showed a decline of 5 points.

While ELL and SWD students did show growth, their proficiency fell below the school, district and state average.

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

8th grade ELA showed the greatest decline from the prior year, with proficiency dropping from 59% proficiency to 54%.

We identified reading as an area of critical need last year and have put a school-wide initiative in place to address deficiencies and increase reading comprehension. We will continue this initiative and continue working with teachers across all content areas to incorporate reading strategies into their classrooms.

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.

In both reading and math, GCJ was above the state and district average. Math was the data component with the greatest gap. with the state average for 8th grade math at 56% and GCJ at 72%. GCJ well exceeded the state average. This is due to the strength of the math team, their collaboration and strong PLC.

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

8th grade math increased by 5 points to bring proficiency to 72%.

Students offered daily opportunities to retake math assignments in our GCJ LEAD Lab. These students are sent during elective periods to ensure they do not miss core instruction.

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

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

The first area of concern is that 219 students were absent 10% or more over the course of the school year. The second area of concern is that 63 students were suspended one or more days, which is a huge increase from the prior school year.

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

- Reading Proficiency
- Supporting ELL Students - increasing reading comprehension
- Supporting SWD Students

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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.

Based on 22-23 FAST Reading scores, reading continues to be an area of critical need. 7th grade proficiency made a slight gain to 61%, 8th grade proficiency dropped to 54%. With the new FAST test, based on school calculations, students showed growth in ELA but the overall proficiency dropped to 58% proficiency. Overall, GCJ did not meet projected learning targets in reading. Also tied to ELA achievement, another area of focus tied to this is reading achievement for ELL students. These students have been tested and placed in intensive reading groups to identify deficits and build reading capacity. They are also receiving 105 per week in Rosetta Stone in their ELA class, with an ELL assistant.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The projected outcome for reading proficiency for the 2023-24 school year will be to increase overall reading proficiency to 65%. This will be measured using data from the 22-23 and 23-24 FAST Reading assessments.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through FAST Progress Monitoring throughout the 2023-24 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Green (monica.green@myoneclay.net)

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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By establishing and utilizing school wide strategies, students will hear common academic language and identified skills across all content areas in order to build capacity and increase reading comprehension.

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.

These strategies are already in place and teachers are working weekly in PLC groups to analyze data, create lessons and build common assessments to monitor student needs.

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

By When: December - PM 2 May - FAST Test

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

Based on Climate and Culture surveys of staff and students from 2022-23, data shows that continuing to build positive relationships between teachers and students will decrease the number of low level discipline referrals and increase instructional time in all classrooms. Through school-wide PBIS initiatives to focus on positive student behaviors and interactions with teachers and staff, Identified school wide expectations will be identified and recognized to celebrate student success in all areas at GCJ.

Measurable Outcome:

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

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

Monitoring:

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

Through supporting teachers with PBIS Initiatives, strong Professional Learning Communities and visible administrative support, GCJ will continue a tradition of a positive culture of learning that supports teachers and students. With continued efforts to teach school-wide expectations and reduce the number of low level misbehaviors in the classroom, teachers will continue to thrive at GCJ.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Green (monica.green@myoneclay.net)

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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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.

PBIS Program - Continuing to promote school wide LEAD Expectations for all students.
Teachers identify and acknowledge positive student behaviors
Recognize students chosen by teachers who consistently exhibit LEAD Attributes.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-24 school year

#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.

For this school year, all standard sections of ELA and math are supported sections, with Support Facilitators pushing in to support learning with classroom teachers. We have also increased inclusion sections to make sure that all classrooms maintain around 20% of SWD students in all classrooms, which mirrors the school population. Learning Strategies class is offered to provide students more support in all content areas and teachers are being trained in learning strategies to provide differentiated instruction for students. Teachers are collaborating together weekly to discuss student needs and develop lessons to provide differentiated instruction based on areas of need.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on FAST Data in ELA and math, SWD students will increase reading proficiency by 10% over the school year.

Monitoring:

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

Data monitoring through FAST testing, formative data provided by classroom teachers and Support Facilitators

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chera Bleau (cfbleau@oneclay.net)

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.)

Offering a learning strategies both as a class and as an intervention in supported classrooms to provide students with small group remediation, building study skills and organizational skills. Our Support Facilitators have received training in this area to benefit students in small group and whole group settings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for this strategy is to identify areas of specific needs for these students and provide interventions to close achievement gaps.

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.

Using strategies to help students build organizational skills, summarizing skills and study skills to close achievement gaps across all content areas.

Person Responsible: Chera Bleau (cfbleau@oneclay.net)

By When: December 2023

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).

At GCJ, both ELL and SWD subgroups fall below 41%. The strategies that we are implementing to address the deficiencies in these subgroups are as follows:

ELL students are tested and strategically scheduled into appropriate Intensive Reading sections to utilize the Corrective Reading Program outlined in Clay County's SERP plan. The reading teacher and ELL assistant will co-teach these sections of reading to serve students and increase English fluency and comprehension. Students will also receive time on Rosetta Stone weekly through their ELA class with the assistance of the ELA teacher and ELL assistant.

After review of our essa subgroup data, we have identified SWD students and placed appropriately with provided accommodations. Staffing specialists and ESE teachers collaborate and plan for supported and co-teaching sections. District personnel and Staffing Specialists provide continued PD opportunities to support teachers. Inclusive scheduling and push in support to provide all students with continued academic support. Two additional Support Facilitators to provide support in classrooms.

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: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$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