

St. Johns County School District

# Picolata Crossing Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Picolata Crossing Elementary School

2675 PACETTI RD, St Augustine, FL 32092

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Brian Morgan**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Picolata Crossing Elementary School

2675 PACETTI RD, St Augustine, FL 32092

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

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	26%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	24%

## School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	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.**

Picolata Crossing Elementary School will inspire good character and a passion for lifelong learning in all students, creating educated and caring contributors to the world.

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

All students will be provided an exceptional education that leads to a well-rounded individual who demonstrates good character, leadership, and critical thinking.

### 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
Goodwin, Kenneth	Principal	<p>The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures professional development to support programs, and communicates with parents regarding overall school progress. In addition, the principal works collaboratively with the leadership team to analyze student data through a cycle of continuous improvement to ensure all students receive services and supports they need to grow socially, emotionally, and academically. Furthermore, the principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build school-wide capacity to better serve our students.</p>
Kolk, Ewa	Assistant Principal	<p>The assistant principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures professional development to support programs, and communicates with parents regarding overall school progress. In addition, the assistant principal works collaboratively with the leadership team to analyze student data through a cycle of continuous improvement to ensure all students receive services and supports they need to grow socially, emotionally, and academically. Furthermore, the assistant principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build school-wide capacity to better serve our students.</p>
Rudi, Cristin	Instructional Coach	<p>The ILC develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. The coach identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with the whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for students considered "at risk"; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring, and is the facilitator of the MTSS team. The ILC plans and provides ongoing, job-embedded professional development to support our instructional staff.</p>

**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	112	109	124	112	115	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	714
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	3	1	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

**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	4	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	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

49

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Saturday 8/24/2019

**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	10	4	7	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	17	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

**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	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

**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	10	4	7	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	17	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

## 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	78%	75%	57%	0%	74%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	73%	67%	58%	0%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	59%	53%	0%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	80%	77%	63%	0%	75%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	69%	62%	0%	69%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	59%	51%	0%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	78%	72%	53%	0%	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	112 (0)	109 (0)	124 (0)	112 (0)	115 (0)	142 (0)	714 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	8 (0)	6 (10)	3 (4)	1 (7)	7 (10)	6 (10)	31 (41)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (3)	0 (2)	3 (0)	6 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	14 (6)	11 (2)	27 (8)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (3)	14 (17)	7 (8)	24 (28)

### 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	74%	78%	-4%	58%	16%
	2018	76%	78%	-2%	57%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	81%	77%	4%	58%	23%
	2018	75%	74%	1%	56%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	78%	76%	2%	56%	22%
	2018	72%	73%	-1%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	79%	82%	-3%	62%	17%
	2018	72%	80%	-8%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	82%	-6%	64%	12%
	2018	89%	83%	6%	62%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	85%	80%	5%	60%	25%
	2018	66%	79%	-13%	61%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	77%	73%	4%	53%	24%
	2018	70%	73%	-3%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
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	44	53	50	53	58	44	19				

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
BLK	50	50		50	90						
HSP	79	69		81	77		79				
MUL	81	36		75	64						
WHT	80	77	64	82	73	58	78				
FRL	62	75	65	67	75	68	64				
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	40	54	58	42	71	76	21				
HSP	77	68		74	68						
MUL	67			50							
WHT	75	71	66	80	75	72	71				
FRL	61	61	61	66	75	65	62				
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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
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	502
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	
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	60
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	77
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	64
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	73
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	68
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.

ELA lowest 25th percentile performed the lowest. Our lowest 25th percentile is mostly comprised of ESE students. This data is similar to last year's data.

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

Math lowest 25th percentile showed the greatest decline from the prior year. We will increase differentiation in the mathematics classes to support our lowest 25th percentile.

#### 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.

5th Grade Math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Our students were 25 points higher than the state. Next, 4th Grade ELA had the second largest greatest gap when compared to the state average. Our students were 23 points higher than the State.

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

3rd Grade Math showed the most improvement with an increase of 7 points. The teachers collaboratively planned and utilized student data to drive their instruction.

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

Two areas of concern are our the learning gains for our lowest 25th percentile in ELA and mathematics.

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

1. Increase performance lowest 25th percentile in ELA
2. Increase performance lowest 25th percentile in mathematics
3. Increase performance of all students in ELA
4. Increase performance of all students in mathematics
5. Increase performance of all students in science

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Increase instructional contact time for lowest 25th percentile. Receive additional small group support minimum 30 minutes weekly.
<b>Rationale</b>	Prioritizing and honoring a grade-level intervention time at all grades, where teachers target instructional needs with researched-based resources, will ensure all that all students receive the support needed to make academic gains. Receive additional small group support minimum 30 minutes weekly.

**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** Providing intensive intervention and support will allow PCES to increase contact time with our lowest 25th percentile and provide strategic instruction to accelerate students' learning and academic gains. Our goal is to have our lowest 25th percentile receive a minimum of 65% learning gains on the FSA ELA and FSA Math.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome** Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy** Ongoing cycles of collective inquiry and implementation

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** Through the collaborative planning process, teachers will increase their capacity to better support their students through strategic lesson implementation.

**Action Step**

**Description** 1. Collaborative planning  
 2. Identify essential outcomes  
 3. Develop and utilize common formative assessments based on team identified essential outcomes/standards  
 4. Data analysis (ongoing cycles of inquiry) - review common formative assessment data (teacher created and district assessments) - identify levels of student performance and plan differentiated lessons to meet the needs of each student and provide increased contact team through small group instruction. In addition, our reading tutor will provide additional small group instruction to our most struggling readers.

**Person Responsible** Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Increase reading comprehension and literacy skills for all students through reader's workshop model.
<b>Rationale</b>	Through collaborative practices, teachers will work together to build capacity with implementing reader's workshop to provide authentic reading opportunities and support to develop students' ability to read and comprehend text effectively.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	80% of students achieve a Level 3 or higher on FSA ELA (Grades 3-5) 85% of students achieve proficiency in iReady for Kindergarten, 75% of 1st grade, and 75% of 2nd grade
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Cristin Rudi (cristin.rudi@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Ongoing cycles of collective inquiry and implementation
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Through the collaborative planning process, teachers will increase their capacity to better support their students through strategic lesson implementation.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collaborative planning</li> <li>2. Identify essential outcomes</li> <li>3. Develop and utilize common formative assessments based on team identified essential outcomes/standards</li> <li>4. Data analysis (ongoing cycles of inquiry) - review common formative assessment data (teacher created and district assessments) - identify levels of student performance and plan differentiated lessons to meet the needs of each student and provide increased contact team through small group instruction.</li> <li>5. Provide job-embedded professional development on reader's workshop through the collaborative teaming process. The ILC will incorporate reader's workshop strategies into the collaborative meetings to assist teachers in developing effective lessons to help student improve their comprehension and literacy skills. In addition, the ILC will provide ongoing classroom coaching support to assist teachers with their implementation of the reader's workshop model.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Cristin Rudi (cristin.rudi@stjohns.k12.fl.us)



<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Increase collaborative planning practices school-wide (culture).
<b>Rationale</b>	Through the collaborative planning process - ongoing, cycles of collective inquiry, teachers will increase their capacity to better serve the needs of all students.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Our goal is to have our lowest 25th percentile receive a minimum of 65% learning gains on the FSA ELA and FSA Math.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Ongoing cycles of collective inquiry and implementation
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Through the collaborative planning process, teachers will increase their capacity to better support their students through strategic lesson implementation.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create time throughout the week to enable teachers to plan collaboratively</li> <li>2. Collaborative planning - provide job-embedded professional development during team planning</li> <li>3. Teams will work through ongoing cycles of inquiry during collaborative planning with the support from our ILC and administrative team.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@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).**

N/A