

St. Johns County School District

Mill Creek Academy



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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mill Creek Academy

3750 INTERNATIONAL GOLF PKWY, St Augustine, FL 32092

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

Demographics

Principal: Kenneth Goodwin

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	20%
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 (65%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (67%) 2014-15: A (66%)
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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mill Creek Academy

3750 INTERNATIONAL GOLF PKWY, St Augustine, FL 32092

<http://www-mce.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-8	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	22%

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 Mill Creek we will inspire students to be lifelong learners with integrity.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Learning community of Mill Creek will ensure that ALL achieve their fullest potential through challenging, purposeful learning opportunities where life-long learning becomes a passion!

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
Riedl, Amanda	Principal	
Stackhouse, Stacy	Assistant Principal	
Hutchinson, andrea	Teacher, K-12	
Brackett, Christy	Teacher, K-12	
Keeperman, Debra	Teacher, K-12	
Howell, Alisa	Teacher, ESE	
Bergmann, Abby	Instructional Media	
Jackson, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	
Jackson, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Chicerelli, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	
Shely, Denise	Instructional Coach	
Schneider, Susan	Teacher, K-12	
Alaimo, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	6th Grade
Hodges, Lindsay	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade
Stadt, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade
Ottosen, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	
Hughes, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade
Arnold, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	
Quinlan, Noreen	Teacher, K-12	
Thomas, Cammie	Psychologist	
Brown, Kristy	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	153	133	151	146	184	144	183	151	0	0	0	0	0	1245
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	5	4	11	8	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	3	1	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	47
iReady ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
iReady Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	0	3	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	15

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		5	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times		0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

63

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/21/2019

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	16	25	31	35	23	40	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	215
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	10	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	2	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	16	25	31	35	23	40	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	215
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	10	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	2	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	73%	84%	61%	72%	84%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	67%	59%	64%	68%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	61%	54%	49%	70%	51%
Math Achievement	74%	88%	62%	79%	88%	58%
Math Learning Gains	64%	71%	59%	69%	73%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	66%	52%	54%	70%	50%
Science Achievement	73%	77%	56%	78%	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	
Number of students enrolled	153 (0)	133 (0)	151 (0)	146 (0)	184 (0)	144 (0)	183 (0)	151 (0)	0 (0)	1245 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (16)	6 (25)	5 (31)	4 (35)	11 (23)	8 (40)	5 (45)	14 (0)	0 (0)	53 (215)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	9 (0)	0 (0)	15 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	1 (10)	9 (20)	19 (16)	18 (0)	0 (0)	47 (47)
iReady ELA	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
iReady Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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	69%	78%	-9%	58%	11%
	2018	69%	78%	-9%	57%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	77%	1%	58%	20%
	2018	75%	74%	1%	56%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	76%	76%	0%	56%	20%
	2018	83%	73%	10%	55%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
06	2019	69%	74%	-5%	54%	15%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	75%	82%	-7%	62%	13%
	2018	77%	80%	-3%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2019	80%	82%	-2%	64%	16%
	2018	79%	83%	-4%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	71%	80%	-9%	60%	11%
	2018	76%	79%	-3%	61%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
06	2019	61%	74%	-13%	55%	6%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
07	2019	100%	80%	20%	54%	46%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		100%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	72%	73%	-1%	53%	19%
	2018	76%	73%	3%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

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					
2018					

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					
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	38	51	43	48	53	38	43				
ASN	86	88		91	81						
BLK	63	73		68	75						
HSP	73	73	40	71	68	58	76				
MUL	80	83		80	75		90				
WHT	72	68	58	73	61	46	70				
FRL	64	71	52	66	65	55	70				
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	38	50	38	52	54	35	50				
ASN	73	64		93	79						
BLK	70			80							
HSP	80	69		73	70	58	69				
WHT	74	66	57	77	72	54	80				
FRL	58	50	43	59	62	50	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	37	45	29	46	54	41	43				
ASN	89	60		100	90						
BLK	64			64							
HSP	73	60	50	68	60	54	84				
MUL	67	60		81	55						

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
WHT	72	64	49	80	71	54	78				
FRL	58	64	54	60	64	53	73				

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	65
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	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	
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 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	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	70
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	66
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	82
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	64
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	63
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.

Learning gains for students below the 25%, in both math and reading continue to be the lowest performing area. Reteach structures and ESE support services in addition to specific interventions that had been put in place were not used with fidelity.

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

The greatest decline was shown in the 6th grade math cohort. This area showed a 15% decline. Transitioning to a K - 8, systems were not well-developed to provide the continuous support for reteach opportunities for students and ESE support beyond required minutes.

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.

Performance of students in lowest 25% math showed a gap compared to the state. A lack of content knowledge and specific strategies to address deficiencies continue to be the barrier in increased performance of these students. Prior to 2019, our students below the 25% were showing a positive trend of improvement.

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

In addition to our learning gains for all students in the area of ELA showed a 3% increase, the greatest area of improvement was seen students identified as SWD in the lowest 25%. They showed a 5% increase in learning gains. Constantly re-evaluating the interventions used to meet specific student needs ensures student learning continues to show improvement.

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

The learning gains of students below the 25% continue to show a decrease in learning gains.

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

1. Learning gains for lowest 25% in both ELA and Math
2. Work to close the achievement dip in the 6th grade cohort in Math.
3. Building a positive culture and climate that promotes student ownership in their learning.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Learning gains in Math for students below the 25%, specifically SWD.
Rationale	Although SWD continue to show limited learning gains in the area of math, last year SWD had a 3% increase in MA learning gains.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Mill Creek will have a 5% increase in learning gains for students below the 25% in Math, increasing from 48% to 53%. 100% of students identified below the 25% will attain the stretch growth goal measured by iReady.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stacy Stackhouse (stacy.stackhouse@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Grade Levels will work as a professional learning community through the High Leverage Team process to identify Essential Standards, determine agreed upon level of rigor of student learning outcomes and develop a "system of response" including a set of intervention strategies/practices that they know have a positive impact on student learning.</p> <p>Additionally, grade levels will use the Individual Learning Progressions for students in iReady for small group/individualized instruction.</p> <p>During Data Dialogue meetings, grade levels will identify specific high-yield strategies that have shown the greatest impact on specific learning deficiencies.</p> <p>Teams will develop opportunities for students to track their own learning needs and to plan their next learning action. This ensures students stay active and present in their own learning.</p> <p>Working together to identify a common understanding of what the learning looks like within a standard and the common misconceptions/mistakes for each of our grade level essentials. This ensures students throughout a grade level or content area equal access to learning.</p> <p>Determining and agreeing upon the level of rigor for student learning outcomes ensures fidelity throughout the learning opportunities for students.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grade Levels/Content Area will unpack all standards with the grade level. 2. Grade levels will identify grade level essentials. 3. Working together teams will identified and agree upon the level of rigor and how it will be assessed(method) as a grade level 4. Teams will determine the instructional timeline and data dialogue date to analyze the data and identify strategies that were most effective during instruction 5. Teams will plan system of response for reteaching with high yield strategies identified during data dialogue meeting.
Person Responsible	Amanda Riedl (amanda.riedl@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Learning gains in ELA for students below 25%, specifically SWD.
Rationale	Although SWD continue to show limited learning gains in the area of ELA, last year SWD had a 5% increase in ELA learning gains for students below the 25%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Mill Creek will have a 5% increase in learning gains for students below the 25% in the area of ELA, increasing from 43% to 48%. 100% of students below the 25% will attain their stretch growth goal measured by iReady.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amanda Riedl (amanda.riedl@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Grade Levels will work as a professional learning community through the High Leverage Team process to identify Essential Standards, determine agreed upon level of rigor of student learning outcomes and develop a "system of response" including a set of intervention strategies/practices that they know have a positive impact on student learning.</p> <p>Additionally, grade levels will use the Individual Learning Progressions for students in iReady for small group/individualized instruction.</p> <p>During Data Dialogue meetings, grade levels will identify specific high-yield strategies that have shown the greatest impact on specific learning deficiencies.</p> <p>Teams will develop opportunities for students to track their own learning needs and to plan their next learning action. This ensures students stay active and present in their own learning.</p> <p>Working together to identify a common understanding of what the learning looks like within a standard and the common misconceptions/mistakes for each of our grade level essentials. This ensures students throughout a grade level or content area equal access to learning.</p> <p>Determining and agreeing upon the level of rigor for student learning outcomes ensures fidelity throughout the learning opportunities for students.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grade Levels/Content Area will unpack all standards with the grade level. 2. Grade levels will identify grade level essentials. 3. Working together teams will identified and agree upon the level of rigor and how it will be assessed(method) as a grade level 4. Teams will determine the instructional timeline and data dialogue date to analyze the data and identify strategies that were most effective during instruction 5. Teams will plan system of response for reteaching with high yield strategies identified during data dialogue meeting.
Person Responsible	Amanda Riedl (amanda.riedl@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Building a culture to empower students to pursue a passion for life-long learning.
Rationale	Creating a culture that motivates(engages) students in the process of their own learning equips students with the skills necessary to guide their path to college and career readiness.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	MCA will strive to maintain a 95% attendance rate school-wide.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amanda Riedl (amanda.riedl@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	PBS has shown to have a positive impact on the learning environment using educational and systems change methods (environmental redesign) to enhance quality of life and minimize problem behavior. Developing a culture that is built on strong values and beliefs and teaching all stakeholders how we respect these values, provides ways to recognize, reward, and reinforce what matters most in the learning environment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Building a climate and culture that shows respect, as a whole, for academic performance, character development, and the commitment to student learning are key contributors in increased attendance, improved academic performance and behavior, higher teacher retention rates, and a boost in overall school spirit.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each classroom in K - 5 will recognize student's that show excellence in academics, character development, PRIDE character traits, and perseverance quarterly. 2. Grade levels that maintain a 95% or higher attendance rate will receive the A+ in Attendance banner to showcase 3. Staffulty attendance at 95% or higher will be recognized at school-wide faculty meetings. 4. Middle School students will have quarterly rallies that recognize and reward students that have met the Gold, Silver, or Blue levels of Renaissance. 5. PRIDE Bucks will be given to students for going above and beyond and recognized on Friday's with a public display on the student's desk.
Person Responsible	Amanda Riedl (amanda.riedl@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).

We have identified that the overall content knowledge understanding in the area of math continues to be a barrier in math achievement beyond 4th grade. Providing on-going, job-embedded math support, 4th, 5th, and 6th grade teachers will identify specific areas of focus and strategies to implement with fidelity. Throughout observation and feedback, teachers and staff will develop student progression plans that align to standards to ensure students are having access to practice areas to close learning gaps, while

still having access to grade level learning.

Providing students with small group, flexible groupings, teachers will work together to build common understanding of what the learning looks like and how to assess at the correct level of difficulty.