# Julington Creek Elementary School

**2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan**

## Table of Contents

# 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**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 18% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (79%)<br><br>2017-18: A (76%)<br><br>2016-17: A (78%)<br><br>2015-16: A (79%) |
| **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 2/16/2021.

## 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

# 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) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School PK-5 | No | 14% |

| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 27% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | A | A | A | A |

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

## 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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 | |
| Lewis, Lisa | SAC Member | |
| Morrison, Donna | Instructional Coach | |
| Grimm, Amy | SAC Member | |
| Johnston, Dana | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Lucas, Dolly | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Gilbert, Wendy | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Haynes, Julie | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Rodriguez, Ashley | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Barrett, Karin | Teacher, K-12 | |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Saturday 7/1/2017, Joy Reichenberg

**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.*
5

**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.*
15

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
60

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 18% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (79%)<br><br>2017-18: A (76%)<br><br>2016-17: A (78%)<br><br>2015-16: A (79%) |
| **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. | |

**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 | 136 | 158 | 168 | 146 | 182 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 990 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

**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 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 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 |

**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 | 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 |

## 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** | |
| | (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.**

| | | | 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% |
| 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% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 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 | | | | |
| 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% | 0 |
| **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% | 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 | 92 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 71 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 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 | 81 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 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.**

Bottom quartile math learning gains decreased by 12%. Possible contributing factor was a PLC focus on ELA. This has not been a trend. We have 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.

**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. 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?**

Eight 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. Other specifically relating to Bottom Quartile Math Learning Gains.** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Bottom quartile math learning gains decreased 12% from 2017-2018. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | 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. All teachers received Schoology (online learning platform) training this summer. This will enhance distance learning interventions for our bottom 25. It will also assist if any of our classes and/or school district must quickly pivot to distance learning. Teachers will also be able to offer ongoing additional virtual resources to families so they may also have the ability to support at home. |
| **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 Steps to Implement

1. Review essential math standards with collaborative teams.
2. Analyze progress monitoring data, identify bottom quartile, & plan individualized interventions.
3. Conduct individual teacher data chats.
4. Flexible grouping intervention & MTSS.
5. Progress monitor to measure growth, lack of growth, and plan for specific essential standards.
6. Ongoing teacher Schoology training.
7. Offer resources to families through Schoology.

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

| #2. Other specifically relating to Bottom Quartile Reading Learning Gains. | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | District focus to increase learning gains by 5% specifically for students scoring a level 1 or 2. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | 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 indicted by their data (FSA strands, iReady benchmarks, formative assessments). All teachers received Schoology (online learning platform) training this summer. This will enhance distance learning intervention for our bottom 25. It will also assist if any of our classes and/or school district must quickly pivot to distance learning. Teachers will also be able to offer additional ongoing virtual resources to families so they may also have the ability to support at home. |
| **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 Steps to Implement

1. Review essential ELA standards with collaborative teams
2. Analyze progress monitoring data, identify bottom quartile, & plan individualized interventions.
3. Conduct individualized teacher data chats.
4. Flexible grouping intervention & MTSS.
5. Progress monitor to measure growth, lack of growth, and plan for specific essential standards.
6. Ongoing teacher Schoology training.
7. Offer resources to families through Schoology.

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

| #3. Other specifically relating to Increase STEM related activities in the classroom. | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and 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. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Increase 5th grade science scores by 4% (76% 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 Steps to Implement

1. Collaborative teams will identify essential science standards.
2. Collaborative teams will design labs around the essential standards.
2. STEM teacher will focus on science essential standards through engaging STEM acitivities once a week.

| **Person Responsible** | [no one identified] |
|---|---|

*No description entered*

| **Person Responsible** | [no one identified] |
|---|---|

| **#4. Other specifically relating to Character Counts** |
|---|

| Area of Focus Description and 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 SJCSD 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. |
|---|---|
| Measurable Outcome: | 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 Steps to Implement** |
|---|

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. School individual/group counseling (also available through virtual platform ).
6. Social emotional lessons offered by the classroom teacher and guidance counselors.

| Person Responsible | Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

| **Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities** |
|---|

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

**An additional area of focus for JCE will be focussing on our SWD in 5th grade science. Student achievement for this group was 42%. We would like to increase it to 50% by having them engage in hands-on science rotations with ESE teachers and additional small group instruction.**

## 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.

Stakeholders impact our positive school cutlure. They are actively involved in the following ways: PTO/SAC meetings and community activities, STEMulating Night of Science & Literacy, Family Bingo & Scavenger Hunts, Staff Appreciation Week, Parent & Community Informational Sessions to inform about district financial decisions, cyber safety, and any other current topics.

### Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.