

St. Johns County School District

Picolata Crossing Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 11/30/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
2019-20 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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (71%) 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	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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Picolata Crossing Elementary School

2675 PACETTI RD, St Augustine, FL 32092

<http://www-pce.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	20%
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
Grade	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.

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Morgan, Brian	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>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 11/30/2020, Brian Morgan

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.*

53

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.*

53

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
2019-20 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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (71%) 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	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	118	114	127	118	117	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	740
Attendance below 90 percent	8	0	4	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	12	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	1	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/6/2020

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	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
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	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
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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	
	(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	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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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				
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

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	0
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	60
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	77
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	64
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	73
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	68
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.

ELA lowest 25th percentile performed the lowest. Our lowest 25th percentile is mostly comprised of ESE students. There is a similar trend with the ESE/SWD subgroup data and with previous years 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. Our lowest 25th percentile is mostly comprised of ESE students. There is a similar trend with the ESE/SWD subgroup data.

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. 4th grade ELA had the second largest 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?

Areas of concern are the number of students in 4th grade receiving Level 1 on FSA math (8) and 5th grade receiving Level 1 on FSA math (12). In addition, the attendance of our younger students is a concern.

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

1. Increase performance of lowest 25th percentile in ELA
2. Increase performance of 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:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase instructional contact time for lowest 25th percentile (multiple under-performing subgroups). Receive additional small group support specific to their needs minimum 30 minutes weekly.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to have our lowest 25th percentile receive a minimum of 65% learning gains on the FSA ELA and Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Through small group, differentiated instruction students will receive additional instruction and support specific to their individual needs.

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 Steps to Implement

Grade-level teams will plan collaboratively

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Teachers will identify essential standards, unpack standards, develop and utilize common formative assessments, and develop/implement differentiated lessons.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Data analysis (ongoing cycles of inquiry) - review common formative assessment data (teacher created and district assessments) - identify levels of student performance - adjust lessons to accelerate the learning for all students. In addition, our reading tutor will provide additional small group instruction to our most struggling students.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Through the Reader's Workshop model, students will engage in authentic literacy strategies and activities with the support of their teacher to improve their reading comprehension skills.

Measurable Outcome: 80% of students achieve a Level 3 or higher on FSA ELA (Grades 3-5). 85% of student achieve proficiency in iReady for Kindergarten, 75% of 1st Grade, and 75% of 2nd Grade

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cristin Rudi (cristin.rudi@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Reader's Workshop model is an evidenced based strategy to engage students in authentic reading experiences to improve reading comprehension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Key principles of differentiation are embedded in Reader's Workshop, which makes it an effective teaching strategy to use with students at different stages of reading development. This will enable teachers to meet the specific needs of each student.

Action Steps to Implement

Collaboratively plan lessons and incorporate the Reader's Workshop model.

Person Responsible Cristin Rudi (cristin.rudi@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Provide job-embedded professional development on Reader's Workshop model through the collaborative teaming process. The ILC will incorporate Reader's Workshop strategies into the collaborative meetings to assist teacher with planning and implementing differentiated lessons.

Person Responsible Cristin Rudi (cristin.rudi@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

The ILC will provide ongoing coaching support in the classroom to assist teachers in improving their implementation of the Reader's Workshop model.

Person Responsible Cristin Rudi (cristin.rudi@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We will continue with our development and implementation of Professional Learning Communities with all core content teachers. Teachers work collaboratively to plan and implement lessons that meet the individual needs of students. Teams utilize data from common formative assessments to evaluate their impact on students and make adjustments to their instruction.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to have our lowest 25th percentile receive a minimum of 65% learning gains on the FSA ELA and Math. 80% of students achieve a Level 3 or higher on FSA ELA (Grades 3-5). 85% of student achieve proficiency in iReady for Kindergarten, 75% of 1st Grade, and 75% of 2nd Grade.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Brian Morgan (brian.morgan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Professional Learning Communities is an evidence-based strategy to improve the quality of instruction and improve student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We want our students to continually grow academically and our students grow as much as we grow. We will continue to build our capacity to better meet the needs of our students through the collaborative process.

Action Steps to Implement

Create time throughout the week to enable teacher to plan collaboratively

Person Responsible Brian Morgan (brian.morgan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Collaborative planning - provide job-embedded professional development during team planning

Person Responsible Cristin Rudi (cristin.rudi@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Teams work through ongoing cycles of inquiry during collaborative planning with support from our ILC and administrative team.

Person Responsible Cristin Rudi (cristin.rudi@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Morning meetings at the beginning of the school year. This will help teachers connect with students, build stronger relationships, and help students emotionally connect with our school. In addition, we will do a HUGS (Hello, Update, Goodbye) program with our lowest 25% percentile students and students needing additional emotional support. Our guidance counselor will conduct classroom lessons throughout the year connected to our Character Counts program.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to have our lowest 25th percentile receive a minimum of 65% learning gains on the FSA ELA and Math. 80% of students achieve a Level 3 or higher on FSA ELA (Grades 3-5). 85% of student achieve proficiency in iReady for Kindergarten, 75% of 1st Grade, and 75% of 2nd Grade.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ewa Kolk (ewa.kolk@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Morning meetings, HUGS program, and Character Counts are evidenced based programs that support students' social, emotional, and learning needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teaching the whole child helps students socially, emotionally, and academically. It is difficult for students to learn if their emotional needs are not met. With a greater emphasis on social and emotional programs, we will help students feel more confident and reach their greatest potential.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development for teachers on morning meetings.

Person Responsible Ewa Kolk (ewa.kolk@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Professional development for teacher on the HUGS program.

Person Responsible Ewa Kolk (ewa.kolk@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Identify students for the HUGS program

Person Responsible Ewa Kolk (ewa.kolk@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Implement morning meetings, HUGS program, and Character Counts program

Person Responsible Ewa Kolk (ewa.kolk@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evaluate the effectiveness of the programs and make appropriate adjustments

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

Stakeholder input and communication is a priority at PCES. We gather their input formally and informally through surveys, conversations, emails, meetings, and committees (School Advisory Council - SAC, PTA). Our SAC and Team Leaders review student data and all aspects of our school. This information is used to develop our school improvement plan (SIP). Since we do not have end-of-year state performance data, we will review our most recent data and gather new data at the beginning of this year to refine our SIP to meet the needs of all students.

Through ongoing input from our stakeholders and monitoring of school-wide data, the SAC and Team Leaders will offer recommendations and adjustments that need to be made to improve the quality of instruction and maintain a positive school culture.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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