St. Johns County School District

The Evelyn Hamblen Center

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 6/19/2010

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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
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 is pending approval by the St. Johns County School Board.

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

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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 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 is pending approval by the St. Johns County School Board.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McMahon, Patricia	Principal	
Davis, Craig	Assistant Principal	
Rule, Kristopher	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 6/19/2010, Craig Davis

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

12

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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
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](#).	

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	0	5	5	5	5	5	2	8	9	1	3	2	0	50
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	3	1	2	5	5	1	1	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	2	5	1	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	0	2	2	2	1	2	4	1	2	0	0	16

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 6/19/2020

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	
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	

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	
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	1	0	1	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	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	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%

Indicator		Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**		
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)		0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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

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%
	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

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	2
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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%	0
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%	0
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%	2
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%	0

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 data is not available for the Transition School due to the small class size and the transitory nature of the school. The school has kept a "maintaining" school improvement rating for the last 2 years. Comparing other available data, i.e. iReady, we can tell that the majority of students are 1 or more years behind grade level in both reading and math.

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

Specific data is 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.

Specific data is not avialble

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

Specific data is not available

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

When considering EWS data the 2 areas of concern are attendance, with almost 21% absent more than 10% of instructional time, and the % of students on FSA at level 1, and those assessing at 1 or more years behind grade level according to iReady. and FSA.

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

1. Attendance
2. Parent Involvement
3. Academic Achievement
4. Mental Health needs
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the school EWS data almost 21% of students in the Transition School are absent for more than 10% of classroom instruction. Regular student attendance is of paramount importance when trying to assist students with not only achievement
Measurable Outcome:	The Transition School will improve student attendance by 5% during the 2020-2021 school year as seen in the state EWS database.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Patricia McMahon (patricia.mcmahon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Attendance will be monitored daily by school personnel, parents of absent students will be contacted daily.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Monitoring attendance daily will enable the school to determine underlying causes of student absences, open communication with parents regarding those absences and impress on students the importance of attending school regularly.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will schedule quarterly parent conferences and log them (teaching staff)
Clinic days/parent conferences will tracked. (Back office secretary)
Daily phone calls to all absent students will be made (secretary, teaching/paraprofessional staff)
District truancy resources will be utilized. (guidance counsleor)

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increased parental involvement at the school level will have a more positive effect on student grades, attendance, behavior and program success, thereby increasing the number of students returning to the home-zoned schools.
Measurable Outcome:	The number of conferences/meetings with parental involvement will increase by 5%. Resource library will be maintained to share with parents.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Quarterly parent conferences will be planned and tracked to increase parent involvement with the Transition students. During each conference parenting, community and District resources will be reviewed to ensure parents are updated on these resources..
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Higher level of parent involvement should increase student attendance and achievement and lessen negative behaviors.

Action Steps to Implement

Quarterly parent conferences will be scheduled. Conferences will be tracked through sign in sheets.(staff)
Resource library will be maintained for parents use. (Admin)
Clinic days/conferences will be logged. (Back office secretary)
Parenting classes will be offered. (Behavior Specialist).

Person Responsible	Craig Davis (craig.davis@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Community, district and state resources (SEDNET, CARD, Assist, etc), will be updated and reviewed with each parent quarterly to determine needs.

Person Responsible	Patricia McMahon (patricia.mcmahon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Despite the transitory nature of these students and the extreme mental health needs, the school will continue to provide appropriate academic services to the students at the Transition School in an effort to close the achievement gap by providing compensatory, basic skills curriculum.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The culture of the Transition School is already reflects a positive environment. To maintain and continue to improve the school culture the school will further facilitate the "open door" policy allowing parents access to teachers, counselors and administrators and fostering open communication with those parents.

Positive communication and celebrations, a unified PLC and open sharing of solutions to problem solving sessions all contribute to the positive environment.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.