# Gadsden Elementary Magnet School



**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

# Table of Contents

# Gadsden Elementary Magnet School

## 200 PROVIDENCE RD, Quincy, FL 32351

## www.gadsdenschools.org

### 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.**

Gadsden Elementary Magnet School strives to provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Our vision is to assist in the development of confident and responsible individuals who aspire to achieve their full potential. We will do this by providing a welcoming, happy, safe, and supportive learning environment in which everyone is equal and all achievements are celebrated.

## 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Davis, Allysun | Principal | Shaping a vision of academic success for all students.<br>Creating a climate hospitable to education.<br>Cultivating leadership in others.<br>Improving instruction |
| Porter, LaTasha | Instructional Coach | Help teachers improve teaching strategies<br>Implement new instructional ideas throughout the school<br>Promote professional learning<br>Facilitate improvements in instruction and student learning<br>Guide their peers in analyzing and applying the data to improve instruction<br>Advocate for student learning |
| Brockman, Dena | Teacher, K-12 | Help teachers improve teaching strategies<br>Implement new instructional ideas throughout the school<br>Promote professional learning<br>Facilitate improvements in instruction and student learning<br>Guide their peers in analyzing and applying the data to improve instruction<br>Advocate for student learning |
| | Psychologist | Support students' ability to learn and teachers' ability to teach<br>* Apply expertise in mental health, learning, and behavior, to help children and youth succeed academically,<br>socially, behaviorally, and emotionally.<br>* Help create positive environments conducive to learning.<br>* Create intervention services that promote redemptive discipline |

**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.

On August 1, 2023 school leadership, teachers, school staff, parents, students, families,, and businesses came together to analyze the data and develop the School Improvement Plan.

**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 for effective implementation through developing small groups. Within the small groups teachers will develop an assessment calendar, instructional calendar that targets Spring 2023 data.

| Demographic Data<br>Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024 | |
|---|---|
| **2023-24 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Combination School<br>PK-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2022-23 Title I School Status** | Yes |
| **2022-23 Minority Rate** | 100% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 100% |
| **Charter School** | No |
| **RAISE School** | No |
| **ESSA Identification**<br>*updated as of 3/11/2024 | N/A |
| **Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)** | No |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Black/African American Students (BLK)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| **School Grades History**<br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: A<br><br>2019-20: A<br><br>2018-19: A<br><br>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 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 16 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**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 | |

## 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* | 63 | 32 | 53 | 68 | 33 | 55 | 65 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 58 | | | 48 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 69 | | | 50 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 52 | 33 | 55 | 78 | 39 | 42 | 56 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 76 | | | 26 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 81 | | | 38 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 55 | 20 | 52 | 67 | 33 | 54 | 53 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 67 | 38 | 68 | 86 | 43 | 59 | 94 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 76 | 56 | 70 | 100 | 46 | 51 | 79 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | 70 | 74 | | 27 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | 69 | 53 | | 58 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | 50 | 55 | | 59 | 70 | | | |

*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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 66 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 395 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
| --- | --- |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
| --- | --- |
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 76 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 683 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| 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 | | | | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 63 | | | |
| HSP | 69 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 59 | | | |

| 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 | | | | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 75 | | | |
| HSP | 71 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 74 | | | |

**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 | 63 | | | 52 | | | 55 | 67 | 76 | | | |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 61 | | | 48 | | | 46 | 62 | 71 | | 6 | |
| HSP | 69 | | | 69 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 61 | | | 44 | | | 52 | 67 | 72 | | 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 | 68 | 58 | 69 | 78 | 76 | 81 | 67 | 86 | 100 | | | |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 67 | 57 | 73 | 76 | 75 | 77 | 68 | 82 | 100 | | | |
| HSP | 71 | 56 | | 82 | 75 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 66 | 57 | 62 | 75 | 78 | 81 | 65 | 85 | 100 | | | |

| 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 | 65 | 48 | 50 | 56 | 26 | 38 | 53 | 94 | 79 | | | |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 73 | | | 73 | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 60 | 44 | 36 | 53 | 19 | 23 | 54 | 92 | 77 | | | |
| HSP | 83 | 67 | | 67 | 58 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 65 | 51 | 57 | 52 | 25 | 40 | 52 | 92 | 75 | | | |

**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 |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 58% | 24% | 34% | 54% | 4% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 40% | 28% | 12% | 47% | -7% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 81% | 33% | 48% | 47% | 34% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 64% | 26% | 38% | 58% | 6% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 54% | 25% | 29% | 47% | 7% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 75% | 31% | 44% | 50% | 25% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 31% | 35% | -4% | 54% | -23% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 60% | 38% | 22% | 48% | 12% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 100% | 45% | 55% | 59% | 41% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 45% | 24% | 21% | 61% | -16% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 58% | 24% | 34% | 55% | 3% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 18% | 15% | 3% | 51% | -33% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 43% | 25% | 18% | 50% | -7% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 71% | 44% | 27% | 63% | 8% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 67% | 37% | 30% | 66% | 1% |

# 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.**

After a careful review of each data point, it was determined that Science is the area with the greatest need for Improvement. Contributing factors to student performance include the following:
- Rotation schedule failing to adequately provide sufficient time to properly teach the science standards
- Lack of consistent hands-on experiment/labs designed to help students make connections between science
concepts and practice
- Limited vocabulary
- Poor comprehension & reasoning skills

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

Spring 2023 performance data shows a decline in each of the established reporting categories. The most significant decline, however, lies within the area of Social Studies. A comparison of performance data from 2022 to 2023 shows a decline of 15 percentage points.
Contributing factors that directly impacted student performance include but are not limited to minimal interest in Social Studies content, lack of exposure to related vocabulary, little to no interest in reading & an overall lack of preparedness.

**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.**

2023 assessment results show the greatest gap in student performance was in third grade mathematics displaying a 16% difference; the state's achievement score was 59% compared to the school's achievement of 75%. The factors that contributed to the student achievement gap we as follows:
Strategic small group sessions designed to help students make connections
Targeted use of supplemental materials to promote mastery of skills
Consistent method of explicitly presenting material to students
Routinely using data to drive instruction.

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

Unfortunately data reports show a decline in each of the reporting categories.

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

EWS indicate attendance during the months of April & May were the highest for the entire school year. This is typically a time when students experience burnout after actively participating in school for several consecutive months. In an effort to prevent a reoccurrence, school leaders will reevaluate the delivery of instructional service to incorporate more kid friendly activities while maintaining academic integrity.

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

Increased Student Achievement in Science & Math
Increased Parental Involvement
Developing teacher leaders

**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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction

**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.

Less than 50% of the classrooms show standards based aligned instruction when looking at assigned tasks, delivery of instruction and internal assessment results. Using an internal needs assessment, collaborative planning ranked the highest as a priority for instructional growth. Based on this, the primary focus will be to ensure the alignment of instructional standards with delivery of instruction to accelerate learning and provide opportunities for high achievement.

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

100% of the instructional staff will engage in common planning activities that address standards based instruction, effective planning, small group, alignment & implementation.

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

Monitoring will continue throughout the school year during walkthroughs utilizing the iObservation Protocols. Data from walkthroughs will be shared in a timely manner to improve the alignment of instructional delivery & evaluate the effectiveness of instructional materials & activities.
Teachers will also participate in data chats to discuss student performance and next steps.

**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.)

Empower teachers to address instructional delivery and its correlation to student performance.

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

There's been a lack of consistency in the implementation of effective standards-based instructional practices schoolwide. Engaging the staff in professional development focused on collaboration, effective instructional practices, using data to bridge the gap between Tiers I & III will help to raise 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.

Monitor data to make sure implementation is taking place
Provide student and teacher intervention through PLCs
Restructure data chats with instructional staff
Require weekly data chats with students

**Person Responsible:** Allysun Davis (davisa@gcpsmail.com)

**By When:** Spring 2024

| #2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to |
|---|

**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.

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

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

**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.)

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

**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.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

## #3. 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.

Schools with positive cultures have shared narratives, habits of mind, and effective ways of getting things done. Through a concerted effort, we have collaborated to create a coherent vision that will positively impact the culture of the school.

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

At the end of the 2022-2023 school year,14% of the instructional staff left the learning environment. An additional 2% left prior to the end of the school, thus impacting the delivery of instructional services and ultimately impacting student achievement.
By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 90% of the instructional staff will opt to remain at GEMS.

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

The culture of the environment will be monitored throughout the year using the following protocols:
Culture Checks - Periodically done throughout the year
Walk throughs, observations, and teacher data
Address core values & implement the school's mission
Incorporate values in the curriculum

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Allysun Davis (davisa@gcpsmail.com)

### 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.)

Schedule a meeting with key stakeholders including district administrators, school staff, teachers & parent volunteers to build resilience and a community of resources. This will, in turn, support the initiative to retain students and teachers within the school community.

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

Research shows that students benefit from stability within the instructional staff. Employing various techniques designed to recruit and retain staff members will positively impact student achievement, teacher efficacy and parent & community involvement.

### 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.

Provide incentives for teacher & student attendance
Supplement staff for sponsoring different clubs

Highlight/recognize staff members & students each month
Feature students & staff members on the school's webpage throughout the year

**Person Responsible:** LaTasha Porter (porterl@gcpsmail.com)

**By When:** By Spring 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).

Although GEMS is not identified as a TSI, CST or an ATSI school, we will routinely monitor the use of available funds to determine the best use of available resources.

## 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.

The SIP will be presented to parents and community members during a parent meeting. Stakeholders will be given an opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback before the plan is submitted for approval.
Information will be presented in English & Spanish to accommodate the needs of the families we serve.

**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))

Creating and maintaining a positive school environment is an essential component of the school program. The leadership team will assume the responsibility of assessing the school's culture, and modeling attitudes, values and qualities that we would like to see.

Teachers and staff will recognize students for making good choices and exhibiting leadership skills. GEMS regularly highlights student achievements by:
- recognizing individual achievements on the school's Facebook page
- featuring students & staff members on the school's webpage
- using FOCUS, Class Dojo & Google Classroom to inform parents of the great things that are happening at
school
- hosting virtual celebrations to include parents and community members
- Recognizing staff members each month

The school's leadership team will work tirelessly to help everyone understand how they contribute to the school community and how their presence impacts the direction the school is going. This will be accomplished by maintaining transparency and making positive communication a priority with all stakeholders.
Parents will be involved in the culture of the school by giving them a platform for feedback on classroom activities and school programs.

**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 an effort to strengthen the academic program, we will provide opportunities for all children, including each of the subgroups within our population of students to master the B.E.S.T. standards. This will be accomplished by:
- Evaluating the quality of instruction provided to students
- Providing an enriched and accelerated curriculum, which may include programs, activities, and courses necessary to provide a well-rounded education
- Addressing the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the
challenging B.E.S.T. Standards
- evaluating the implementation of, and results achieved using achievement data

**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))**

The Leadership team at GEMS has developed a strategic plan that specifically targets closing the achievement gap among subgroups by 50% by the May 2024. The components of the strategic plan were identified in May (2023) and re-evaluated after a comprehensive review of Spring 2023 performance data in July.

ESSR funds will be used to execute the targets in a effort to significantly reduce the achievement gap of all students. Specifically, funds will be used to support the afterschool program, to provide incentives and to provide instructional materials.

The staff will examine student achievement data to develop plans for delivering Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 supports.

## 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: Benchmark-aligned Instruction | $0.00 |
|---|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: -- Select below --: | $0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment | $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