

St. Johns County School District

The Evelyn Hamblen Center



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	16

The Evelyn Hamblen Center

1 CHRISTOPHER ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

<http://www-gats.stjohns.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Craig Davis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	16

The Evelyn Hamblen Center

1 CHRISTOPHER ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

<http://www-gats.stjohns.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year	2013-14
Grade	I

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Transition School is a therapeutic day school designed to serve ESE students enrolled in grades K-12, up to 22 years of age. These students have been unsuccessful in a behavior unit and require additional behavioral support for success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is the goal of the Transition School to assist students in their social and emotional behaviors through intensive mental health counseling, psychiatric care, case management services and individualized academic instruction to enable them to make adequate progress and ultimately return to their home-zoned school.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McMahon, Patricia	Principal	
Davis, Craig	Assistant Principal	
Sinnwell, Suzanne	Administrative Support	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	2	6	6	7	5	3	6	9	3	2	5	2	0	56	
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	4	1	3	2	2	4	1	2	1	0	0	23	
One or more suspensions	2	4	3	3	2	3	2	5	2	1	2	0	0	29	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	1	0	1	0	0	11	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	1	2	0	1	2	1	5	1	1	2	0	0	18

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

9

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/23/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	5	4	1	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	3	2	1	1	4	1	2	2	1	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	0	1	2	0	0	12

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	4	3	2	1	1	4	0	2	2	0	0	19

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	5	4	1	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	3	2	1	1	4	1	2	2	1	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	0	1	2	0	0	12

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	4	3	2	1	1	4	0	2	2	0	0	19

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	84%	61%	0%	84%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	67%	59%	0%	68%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	61%	54%	0%	70%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	88%	62%	0%	88%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	71%	59%	0%	73%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	66%	52%	0%	70%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	77%	56%	0%	79%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	95%	78%	0%	95%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	2 (0)	6 (0)	6 (0)	7 (0)	5 (0)	3 (0)	6 (0)	9 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	5 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	56 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 (0)	1 (0)	4 (5)	1 (4)	3 (1)	2 (0)	2 (1)	4 (1)	1 (0)	2 (2)	1 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	23 (16)
One or more suspensions	2 (0)	4 (0)	3 (4)	3 (3)	2 (2)	3 (1)	2 (1)	5 (4)	2 (1)	1 (2)	2 (2)	0 (1)	0 (0)	29 (21)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	1 (1)	2 (2)	6 (5)	1 (0)	0 (1)	1 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (12)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	0%	78%	-78%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	78%	-78%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	77%	-77%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	74%	-74%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	76%	-76%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	73%	-73%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	74%	-74%	54%	-54%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	0%	71%	-71%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	72%	-72%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	70%	-70%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	71%	-71%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	76%	-76%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	75%	-75%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	74%	-74%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	74%	-74%	53%	-53%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	82%	-82%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	80%	-80%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	82%	-82%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	83%	-83%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	80%	-80%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	79%	-79%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	74%	-74%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	73%	-73%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	80%	-80%	54%	-54%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	78%	-78%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	73%	-73%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	73%	-73%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	73%	-73%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	72%	-72%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	75%	-75%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	90%	-90%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	89%	-89%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	79%	-79%	62%	-62%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	17	9		17	40						
WHT	20			21							
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	21
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	82
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	21
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Specific FSA data is not available for the Transition School due to the transient nature of the students and the small grade level populations. However, the Transition School has held "Maintaining" status for the past 3 years. Per our iReady reading and math data, students are generally behind 1-2 years academically.

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

FSA data are not available.

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.

Math data appear to indicate the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Factors that may contribute include student hospitalizations, frequent moving, and behavioral issues that inhibit the learning process.

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

Reading data indicate the most improvement. Implementing the daily use of iReady for grades K-8 (Achieve 3000 and APEX for grades 9-12) has strengthened our reading and math instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Per the EWS data, student attendance and academic achievement emerge as key areas of concern.

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

1. Academic progress
2. Mental health support
3. Parental support
4. School safety
5. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	School Culture
Rationale	The Transition School culture is driven by our ensuring a therapeutic environment for our students. To this end, we will continue to improve mental health support to enable more students to return to their home-zoned school, thereby reducing the number of students who need to be enrolled in our program.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Outcome data will include the number of students returning to the home-zoned school, the number of students who attain mental health goals, and the number of students utilizing psychiatric services.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Patricia McMahon (patricia.mcmahon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Social-emotional and mental health support will be provided through the faculty and a team of mental health counselors, respectively. Psychiatric support will also be provided as appropriate. Such support will be consistent with the requirements of our students' individual education plans (IEPs).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Such support enables our program to meet student IEP goals, as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA).
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide and document monthly psychiatric appointments at the school site. 2. Provide and document weekly mental health counseling per student at the school site. 3. Provide and document the daily teaching of social skills in the classroom setting. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Patricia McMahon (patricia.mcmahon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Math Performance
Rationale	According to our ESSA data, our students with disabilities performed at 17% proficiency in math, while within this group, our White students performed at 21% proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students will improve their math performance by 2%, as evidenced by iReady and FSA data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Patricia McMahon (patricia.mcmahon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students will continue to utilize iReady for ongoing math support and progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The use of iReady has been proven to foster student growth in math.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assess for progress monitoring 3 times per year. 2. Students will use iReady 4 times per week. 3. Teachers will monitor progress and adjust learning paths accordingly. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Patricia McMahon (patricia.mcmahon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
#3	
Title	English Language Arts Performance
Rationale	According to our ESSA data, our students with disabilities performed at 17% proficiency in ELA, while within this group, our White students performed at 20% proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students will improve their ELA performance by 2%, as evidenced by Being a Reader, iReady, and FSA data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Patricia McMahon (patricia.mcmahon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students will continue to utilize iReady for ongoing ELA support and progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The use of iReady has been proven to foster student growth in ELA.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assess for progress monitoring 3 times per year. 2. Students will use iReady 4 times per week. 3. Teachers will monitor progress and adjust learning paths accordingly. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Patricia McMahon (patricia.mcmahon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)	

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

The professional learning community model will serve as a foundation for our efforts to ensure a sound therapeutic program.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: School Culture				\$100.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0061 - The Evelyn Hamblen Center	School Improvement Funds	1.0	\$100.00
			<i>Notes: Notes</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Performance				\$100.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0061 - The Evelyn Hamblen Center	School Improvement Funds	1.0	\$100.00
			<i>Notes: Notes</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: English Language Arts Performance				\$81.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0061 - The Evelyn Hamblen Center	School Improvement Funds	1.0	\$81.00
			<i>Notes: Notes</i>			
Total:						\$281.00