R J Murray Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

R J Murray Middle School

150 N HOLMES BLVD, St Augustine, FL 32084

http://www-mms.stjohns.k12.fl.us/

Demographics

Principal: Esther Seward

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	81%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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

R J Murray Middle School

150 N HOLMES BLVD, St Augustine, FL 32084

http://www-mms.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)
Middle School 6-8	No	73%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	B

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.

The R.J. Murray Middle School community will work as one team to ensure there are no limits to our students reaching their maximum potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The purpose of R.J. Murray Middle School is to prepare students for high school and post-secondary opportunities. Our school's focus on College Readiness is to create awareness of post-secondary opportunities for all students through our programs of study in the arts and academics. The goals of the MMS College Readiness program are outlined as follows:
-Improve academic preparedness and performance of students at Murray Middle School for post-secondary education.
-Increase high school graduation rates and promote student enrollment in institutions of higher learning.
-Increase awareness and participation among students and parents in programs and activities that support an understanding of post-secondary enrollment requirements, funding options, and opportunities.
-Increase scholarship opportunities for the high school graduates, as supported by collaborations with the local colleges, city and community agencies, and school district.
-Align school-wide instruction at Murray Middle School to college entrance expectations for students in middle grades.
-Align all college readiness initiatives into one school-wide initiative to prepare all students attending Murray Middle for post-secondary instruction and the workforce.

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
Seward, Esther	Assistant Principal	
Brown, Travis	Principal	
Mierzwinski, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	
Williams, Hannah	Instructional Coach	
Gibeau, Maggie	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Esther Seward

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	81%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	234	223	266	0	0	0	0	723
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	21	21	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	31	28	0	0	0	0	115
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	47	62	0	0	0	0	163
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	47	62	0	0	0	0	163
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	59	70	0	0	0	0	182
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	59	70	0	0	0	0	182

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	44	50	0	0	0	0	154

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	230	268	255	0	0	0	0	753
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	36	56	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	47	60	0	0	0	0	155
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	27	36	0	0	0	0	89
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	86	71	0	0	0	0	207

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	0	0	41	57	67	0	0	0	0	165

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	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	8

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	230	268	255	0	0	0	0	753
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	36	56	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	47	60	0	0	0	0	155
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	27	36	0	0	0	0	89
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	86	71	0	0	0	0	207

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	0	0	41	57	67	0	0	0	0	165

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	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	8

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	58%	68%	54%	55%	69%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	59%	54%	52%	61%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	48%	47%	43%	50%	44%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	58%	77%	58%	59%	76%	56%
Math Learning Gains	56%	68%	57%	49%	65%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	60%	51%	35%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	53%	70%	51%	56%	69%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	75%	88%	72%	72%	87%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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
06	2019	61%	74%	-13%	54%	7%
	2018	58%	71%	-13%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	57%	72%	-15%	52%	5%
	2018	56%	70%	-14%	51%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	61%	71%	-10%	56%	5%
	2018	64%	76%	-12%	58%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	51%	74%	-23%	55%	-4%
	2018	49%	73%	-24%	52%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	60%	80%	-20%	54%	6%
	2018	53%	80%	-27%	54%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
08	2019	43%	78%	-35%	46%	-3%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	30%	73%	-43%	45%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	54%	72%	-18%	48%	6%
	2018	59%	75%	-16%	50%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018	0%	84%	-84%	65%	-65%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	75%	90%	-15%	71%	4%
2018	74%	89%	-15%	71%	3%
Compare		1%			
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	100%	79%	21%	61%	39%
2018	93%	79%	14%	62%	31%
Compare		7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	100%	81%	19%	57%	43%
2018	100%	77%	23%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	16	42	45	19	47	45	13	50			
ASN					70						
BLK	33	42	31	30	42	41	27	54	33		
HSP	55	63	53	52	66	53	33	72			
MUL	48	32		64	57			80			
WHT	66	56	48	67	59	55	65	81	63		
FRL	39	46	40	40	49	46	33	65	34		

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	18	38	41	14	29	27	23	36			
ASN	100			90							
BLK	30	42	38	29	34	21	20	55	54		
HSP	54	50	30	52	52	29	50	61	71		
MUL	75	86		65	38			91			
WHT	67	59	48	62	52	46	72	83	71		
FRL	47	53	42	43	41	29	45	68	58		

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	13	39	38	18	32	30	16	39			
ASN	75	73		92	55						
BLK	22	43	43	27	30	19	16	53	50		
HSP	47	42	46	59	54	38	31	85	75		
MUL	74	57		66	62		77				
WHT	66	56	43	69	55	48	66	75	75		
FRL	38	43	39	43	40	30	42	60	57		

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
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	504

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	70
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	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	62
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	44
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.

Our data indicated that our ELA Achievement and ELA Learning Gains declined. Our 8th grade math also declined in the cohort.

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

Science achievement showed the greatest decline from the previous year. 8th grade also declined in ELA and Math. Factors include a focus on standards-based instruction.

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.

Our ELA lowest quartile learning gains showed the largest gap with the state average. Factors include a focus on standards-based instruction.

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

Our math lowest quartile learning gains showed the most improvement. A focus on intervention strategies contributed to this improvement.

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

The percentage of students who failed an ELA or Math course rose significantly from 17-18 to 18-19. Our suspensions also rose from 17-18 to 18-19.

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

1. Increase schoolwide ELA proficiency
2. Increase schoolwide math proficiency
3. Develop a growth-oriented culture through access to rigorous courses and critical thinking opportunities

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The data indicates a decline in ELA overall performance coupled with our learning gains. We will be continuing to emphasize a cross-curricular literacy vision through our Instructional Leadership Team.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve schoolwide proficiency in literacy by 7% and lowest 25% learning gains by 8%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Hannah Williams (hannah.williams@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will continue to incorporate the PLC process as well as increased connections with the school district's program specialists.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The PLC process will ensure our teachers work together using data to align resources and instruction. The district program specialists will use their knowledge of the curriculum to guide planning and use of instructional resources.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Master schedule developed to support PLC Process
2. Development of common summative assessments to generate data that drives instructional best practices.
3. Embed intervention time into the regular school day to ensure students are receiving timely support and intervention.
4. Schedule regular training with instructional coaches and district program specialists to guide planning, instruction, and assessments.

Person Responsible	Travis Brown (travis.brown@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our data indicates a decrease in math achievement from 7th grade to 8th grade. Our vision is to blend foundational math instruction with standards-based instruction to help bridge the current achievement gap. In addition to improving math achievement scores, we hope to increase our enrollment in advanced math courses.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve schoolwide proficiency data in math by 5% and lowest 25% learning gains by 11%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Mierzwinski (stephanie.mierzwinski@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will continue utilizing the PLC process to ensure teachers collaborate to improve performance for all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Hatti's research states Collective Teacher Efficacy has one of the highest effect sizes. We will continue emphasizing a team-based approach involving data-analysis to find best practices for Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Master schedule developed to support PLC Process
2. Development of common summative assessments to generate data that drives instructional best practices.
3. Embed intervention time into the regular school day to ensure students are receiving timely support and intervention.
4. Schedule regular training with instructional coaches and district program specialists to guide planning, instruction, and assessments.

Person Responsible	Travis Brown (travis.brown@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our direction is to develop an umbrella of Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports to reward students for achieving success with academics and with character. Rewarding student behavior with positive consequences as opposed to negative consequences can have a more long-lasting impact on student achievement. A review of our PBIS systems last year indicated a more focused and systematic approach was needed.
Measurable Outcome:	We will create and monitor PBIS systems at three levels: Classroom, Grade Level, and Schoolwide. 100% of our teachers will contribute to these systems.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Esther Seward (esther.seward@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We are using tracking systems with grade-level teams and schoolwide to monitor student behavior and achievement. We have identified a specific team of leaders to oversee the implementation of our schoolwide umbrella of PBIS systems.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We had great systems of PBIS happening in pockets throughout our school. Our goal was to take the great things happening in pockets and make it schoolwide. We utilized Microsoft OneNote and Microsoft Forms to collect data and increase collaboration between teachers in developing this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Have our Instructional Leadership Team leaders introduce PBIS from a grade-level team level to staff in pre-planning.
2. Develop a PBIS team to plan schoolwide events and strategies
3. Track student behavior and rewards utilizing Microsoft OneNote
4. See funding and grant opportunities to develop resources and rewards for our students

Person Responsible   Esther Seward (esther.seward@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with disabilities at RJMMS averaged 35% proficiency overall. This is significantly lower than our overall school average.
Measurable Outcome:	Students with disabilities at RJMMS will increase their achievement by 6%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Esther Seward (esther.seward@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will utilize the PLC Process and MTSS/Rti to ensure we are supporting and focusing on our students with disabilities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing the PLC Process and MTSS/Rti process will ensure an added focus and layer of support is in place for our students with disabilities. Our teams of teachers as well as our MTSS/Rti will be the primary resources along with extra time and attention devoted to this subgroup.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use a data-based approach to find areas for improvement with our students with disabilities
2. Hold regular meetings and collaboration to identify customized support systems for our students with disabilities.

Person Responsible	Esther Seward (esther.seward@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students from the African-American subgroup average 37% proficiency the last year data was collected.
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase our proficiency in students from the African-American subgroup by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Travis Brown (travis.brown@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will utilize the PLC Process with an added focus on data from our African-American students to ensure we are supporting and focusing on students from the African-American subgroup.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing the PLC Process will ensure an added focus and layer of support is in place for our students from the African-American subgroup. Our teams of teachers will be the primary resources along with extra time and attention devoted to this subgroup.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Embed planning time for teachers to utilize the PLC Process
2. Use the Student Data Dashboard to identify student areas of focus
3. Utilize common summative and formative assessments to gather data to drive Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction that focuses on students from our African American subgroup.

Person Responsible	Travis Brown (travis.brown@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.

.

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.

We are making efforts to build relationships with all of our stakeholders and the community. The principal regularly attends the monthly West Augustine CRA meetings to hear about issues and events that are impacting the local community. During pre-planning we teamed with the CRA to host a supply drive and giveaway for our students who needed extra support. During our quarantine period at the end of last year we utilized virtual game nights twice per week to keep the community engaged from a positive perspective and plan on continuing this process again this year. We will also continue using our clubs and teams to conduct community fundraisers and clean-up events.

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