

St. Johns County School District

Julington Creek Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Julington Creek Elementary School

2316 RACE TRACK RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

Demographics

Principal: Joy Reichenberg

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	18%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (79%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (79%) 2014-15: A (85%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Julington Creek Elementary School

2316 RACE TRACK RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-jce.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)
Elementary School PK-5	No	15%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

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.

At JCE, we will provide quality instruction in core academics as well as additional opportunities for enrichment related to the arts, technology and overall wellness. We will emphasize character education and recognize children who demonstrate qualities of good character both at school and in the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

JCE...where children grow to be well-rounded people of character, innovative and college/career ready.

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
Murphy, Jeanette	Principal	
Hoessler, Donny	Assistant Principal	
Jarriel, Becky	Teacher, ESE	
Dawson, Sherry	Teacher, K-12	
Gilbert, Wendy	SAC Member	
Morrison, Donna	Instructional Coach	
Grimm, Amy	SAC Member	
Johnston, Dana	Teacher, K-12	
Gittings, Bethany	Teacher, K-12	
Byrd, Dana	Teacher, K-12	
Heavener, Marissa	Teacher, K-12	

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	137	147	148	163	189	188	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	972
Attendance below 90 percent	5	4	2	4	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	4	0	3	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

50

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/13/2019

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	2	10	7	7	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	10	7	7	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	86%	75%	57%	86%	74%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	77%	67%	58%	74%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	78%	59%	53%	62%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	89%	77%	63%	90%	75%	61%
Math Learning Gains	78%	69%	62%	77%	69%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	59%	51%	74%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	80%	72%	53%	81%	69%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	137 (0)	147 (0)	148 (0)	163 (0)	189 (0)	188 (0)	972 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 (2)	4 (10)	2 (7)	4 (7)	7 (12)	5 (2)	27 (40)
One or more suspensions	4 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	0 (1)	7 (1)	1 (1)	15 (3)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	6 (0)	10 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (9)	9 (10)	17 (19)

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	83%	78%	5%	58%	25%
	2018	86%	78%	8%	57%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	77%	8%	58%	27%
	2018	82%	74%	8%	56%	26%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	87%	76%	11%	56%	31%
	2018	83%	73%	10%	55%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	87%	82%	5%	62%	25%
	2018	82%	80%	2%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	82%	3%	64%	21%
	2018	89%	83%	6%	62%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	90%	80%	10%	60%	30%
	2018	88%	79%	9%	61%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	79%	73%	6%	53%	26%
	2018	83%	73%	10%	55%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	65	59	54	78	66	61	41				
ELL	64			82	70						
ASN	88	94		96	88						
BLK	78	88		67	53		77				
HSP	75	70	65	82	72	65	65				
MUL	69			92							
WHT	89	77	82	91	80	65	82				

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
FRL	69	65	55	75	58	48	67				
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
SWD	71	58	60	71	67	69	42				
ELL	55	75		73	75						
ASN	97	74		100	84		93				
BLK	86	53		83	82						
HSP	75	66	52	82	69	68	69				
MUL	78	82		94	73						
WHT	86	60	63	88	74	76	89				
FRL	76	54	50	77	61	67	68				
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
SWD	57	53	42	71	65	59	52				
ELL	43			79							
ASN	96	78		96	83						
BLK	95	93		81	69						
HSP	75	67	45	82	74	70	68				
MUL	69	73		62	55						
WHT	87	75	67	92	79	83	82				
FRL	77	67	57	78	67	57	83				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	551
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	61
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	72
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - 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	92
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	73
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	71
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	81
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	81
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

Bottom quartile math learning gains decreased by 12%. Possible contributing factor was a PLC focus on ELA last year. This has not been a trend. This year we added a math focus and a focus on math essential standards.

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

Bottom quartile math learning gains declined by 12%. Possible contributing factor was a PLC focus on ELA last year.

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.

Bottom quartile math learning gains was 12% above the state average. Possible contributing factor was a PLC focus on LEA last year. This is not a trend.

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

Bottom quartile ELA learning gains increased by 16%. PLC focus on ELA, focus on essential standards and interventions.

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

Nine students (rising 5th grade) scoring level 1 on statewide assessment.

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

1. Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains (specifically students scoring level 1 & 2).
2. Reading Bottom Quartile Learning Gains (specifically students scoring 1 & 2).

- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Bottom Quartile Math Learning Gains

Rationale Bottom quartile math learning gains decreased 12% from 2017-18 to 2018-19.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Increase learning gains of bottom quartile by 12% to 75%.
Increase learning gains specifically of those students scoring levels 1 & 2 by 5% (54% to 59%).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

In the beginning of the year, as a faculty, we reviewed learning goals & scales as well as small group strategies. Research supports learning goals and scales, flexible grouping and collaboration. These are all school and district expectations. Individual teacher data chats will take place in September identifying the bottom quartile and discussing possible barriers as well as creating a plan to overcome them. Team data chats will take place after second progress monitoring assessment. Teachers will provide daily targeted instructional interventions (30 min./day). The MTSS committee will also review data points throughout the year, adjust individual intervention plans and instructional materials as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Research states that learning goals and scales, flexible grouping, teacher collaboration, & MTSS all have a significant positive effects on learning.

Action Step

Description

1. Review essential math standards.
2. Analyze progress monitoring data & identify bottom quartile.
3. Teacher data chats.
4. Flexible grouping intervention & MTSS
5. Progress monitor to measure growth, lack of growth, and plan for specific standards.

Person Responsible

Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Bottom Quartile Reading Learning Gains
Rationale	District focus to increase learning gains by 5% specifically for student scoring a level 1 or 2.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase Reading Learning Gains specifically for students scoring a level 1 or 2 by 5% (from 75 to 80%).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	In the beginning of the year, teams reviewed essential standards in ELA. We also reviewed learning goals & scales as well as small group strategies. Research supports learning goals and scales, flexible grouping and collaboration. These are all school and district expectations. Individual data chats will take place in September identifying the bottom quartile and discussing possible barriers as well as creating a plan to overcome them. Team data chats will take place after second progress monitoring assessment. Teachers will provide daily targeted instructional interventions (30 min./day). The MTSS committee will also review data points throughout the year, adjust individual intervention plans and instructional materials as needed. Instructional tutors will also work with our bottom quartile daily (30-45 min) on specific skills as indicated by their data (FSA strands, iReady benchmarks, formative assessments).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research states that learning goals and scales, flexible grouping, teacher collaboration, & MTSS all have a significant positive effects on learning.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review essential ELA standards. 2. Analyze progress monitoring data & identify bottom quartile. 3. Teacher data chats. 4. Flexible grouping intervention & MTSS 5. Progress monitor to measure growth, lack of growth, and plan for specific standards.
Person Responsible	Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Increase STEM related activities in the classroom
Rationale	Science 5th scores decreased by 4%. Increasing STEM related activities in the classroom will increase 5th grade science scores, will develop creative thinking as well as expose students to skills needed for future careers in science, technology, engineering, and math.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase 5th grade science scores by 4% (80% to 80%).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Through exploration and discovery, students will learn by doing while enjoying themselves in an environment of healthy competition where it is safe to fail and where fast failure can be a strategic tool of innovation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	STEM skills will be the leading factor in the ever growing technology economy.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase interactive technology in all classroom. 2. Provided teacher inservice. 3. Create a rotation of science stations by standards. 4. STEM Fair 5. After school Robotics Club
Person Responsible	Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4

Title Character Counts**Rationale**

In 1998, the St. Johns County School District, along with area businesses, youth organizations and civic groups, selected the national character education program of CHARACTER COUNTS! as a countywide initiative to instill positive character traits in our young people. Each fall during the national observance we honor area businesses that have contributed to the CHARACTER COUNTS! effort, and in the spring, the district sponsors the annual American Youth Character Awards program to recognize high school students of good character. As adults we are responsible for modeling appropriate behavior which has been proven as the best way to teach character in others. Several years ago, the SJCS D became the first school district in Florida to implement Pursuing Victory with Honor in all of its athletic programs. Character education is an important part of every School Improvement Plan, a major component of each Student Code of Conduct and our Strategic Plan.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Decrease office referrals by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

In the beginning of the year we demonstrated examples of each character counts pillar (semester assembly). Teachers model character counts pillars daily and provide relevant lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

As adults and educators, we are responsible for modeling appropriate behavior which has been proven as the best way to teach character in others.

Action Step**Description**

1. Good Jaguar Expectations Assembly (once a semester)
2. Weekly & Monthly Good Jaguar Recognition
3. Teacher/Staff Recognition (modeling Character Counts Pillars)
4. Good Jaguar in the Cafe' Incentive Program
- 5.

Person Responsible

Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@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).