St. Johns County School District

Sebastian Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sebastian Middle School

2955 LEWIS SPEEDWAY, St Augustine, FL 32084

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

Demographics

Principal: K IR Stie Gabaldon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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)	44%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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

Sebastian Middle School

2955 LEWIS SPEEDWAY, St Augustine, FL 32084

http://www-sms.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	57%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	24%

School Grades History

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

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.

Sebastian Middle 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.

Sebastian Middle School's vision is to cultivate high achieving, college and career ready students who excel in a complex and changing world.

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
Gabaldon, Kirstie	Principal	Duties typically seen to by a principal.
Fortune, Leanne	School Counselor	Duties typically assigned to a guidance counselor
Hoechst, Robert	Psychologist	Duties typically seen to by a school psychologist.
Hensley, Angela	Assistant Principal	Duties typically seen by an assistant principal
Hayes, Kevin	Dean	Duties typically held by the dean.
Tagliarini, Darrin	School Counselor	counselor
Hodges, Matt	Instructional Coach	ILC

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, K IR Stie Gabaldon

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.*
1

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

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)	44%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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	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	278	253	216	0	0	0	0	747
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	37	25	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	27	14	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	73	34	0	0	0	0	117
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	73	34	0	0	0	0	117
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	54	53	0	0	0	0	142
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	54	53	0	0	0	0	142

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	19	58	29	0	0	0	0	106

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	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/13/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	278	257	220	0	0	0	0	755
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	35	40	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	33	40	0	0	0	0	103
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	9	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	50	60	0	0	0	0	153

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	23	34	37	0	0	0	0	94

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	278	257	220	0	0	0	0	755
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	35	40	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	33	40	0	0	0	0	103
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	9	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	50	60	0	0	0	0	153

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	23	34	37	0	0	0	0	94

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	55%	68%	54%	53%	69%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	59%	54%	54%	61%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	48%	47%	40%	50%	44%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	61%	77%	58%	60%	76%	56%
Math Learning Gains	61%	68%	57%	52%	65%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	60%	51%	33%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	65%	70%	51%	54%	69%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	88%	72%	70%	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	60%	74%	-14%	54%	6%
	2018	49%	71%	-22%	52%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	57%	72%	-15%	52%	5%
	2018	54%	70%	-16%	51%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	55%	71%	-16%	56%	-1%
	2018	54%	76%	-22%	58%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	59%	74%	-15%	55%	4%
	2018	54%	73%	-19%	52%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	55%	80%	-25%	54%	1%
	2018	58%	80%	-22%	54%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	53%	78%	-25%	46%	7%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	40%	73%	-33%	45%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	63%	72%	-9%	48%	15%
	2018	60%	75%	-15%	50%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	100%	87%	13%	67%	33%
2018	100%	84%	16%	65%	35%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	80%	90%	-10%	71%	9%
2018	75%	89%	-14%	71%	4%
Compare		5%			

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	99%	79%	20%	61%	38%
2018	96%	79%	17%	62%	34%
Compare		3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	100%	81%	19%	57%	43%
2018	100%	77%	23%	56%	44%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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	19	39	39	25	52	49	22	52			
ASN	80			90							
BLK	23	43	47	27	51	49	28	48			
HSP	50	47	20	51	56	42	60	79	56		
MUL	61	41		72	65						
WHT	59	54	43	65	63	59	68	81	66		
FRL	38	46	46	47	54	52	50	62	35		

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	22	38	40	28	37	30	27	51	30		
BLK	24	27	32	34	40	39	30	50	40		
HSP	50	48	25	59	60	56	43	59			
MUL	44	54		53	33						
WHT	56	46	42	63	54	42	69	78	69		
FRL	38	41	40	47	47	39	47	66	54		

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	41	38	19	34	36	16	38			
ASN	91			100							
BLK	24	40	33	32	43	35	27	44			
HSP	52	61	50	45	42	27	64	50			
MUL	53	58		59	41						
WHT	57	55	42	65	55	34	58	76	63		
FRL	41	48	41	46	43	28	44	62	48		

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
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	531
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	85
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	40
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	51
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	60
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	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	48
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.

The ELA lowest quartile showed the lowest percentage, which includes many of our students with disabilities and students who are African-American. Students are entering Middle School below grade level. The lowest quartile gains in ELA have been stagnant.

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

Our 7th grade math score decreased by 3% last school year.
The 7th grade math team was comprised of two inexperienced math teachers. The math coach began working with this team and continues to do so this school year.

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.

The ELA lowest quartile showed the lowest percentage, which includes many of our students with disabilities and students who are African-American. Students are entering Middle School below grade level. The lowest quartile gains in ELA have been stagnant.

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

The 8th grade math proficiency increased by 13% with the implementation of the math coach. A renewed focus on standards and instructional strategies pushed the team forward.

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

There are concerns about how many students in each grade level are level 1 ON FSA in ELA or Math.

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

1.Close the achievement gap in ELA and math in our students with disabilities - 37% and schoolwide scores 59% Increasing ELA and math scores by 3% at each grade level.
2. Students who are African-American 41% and schoolwide scores 59% Increasing ELA and math scores by 3% at each grade level.
3. Increasing ELA lowest quartile learning gains from 41% to 50%
4. Increasing Math lowest quartile learning gains from 54% to 60%
5. Creating a Single School Culture

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To narrow the gap between students with disabilities and the schoolwide scores. The data indicates that only 37% of our students with disabilities are proficient in ELA and math.
Measurable Outcome:	The gap between our subgroups and our school wide average meeting proficiency will simultaneously raise and narrow by 3% as demonstrated by classroom grades, district and state exam scores, and FSA data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kirstie Gabaldon (kirstie.gabaldon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Identify and monitor students with disabilities. 2. The master schedule will allow for additional sections of Math, creating smaller class size in the standard math classes. 3. The Exceptional Education students will receive support facilitation 5 days a week in their math and ELA class when Support is on their IEP 4.. Faculty meetings will include coaching on instructional pedagogy on feedback for struggling students. 5. PLC Teams will Track data in summative assessments, and use to inform instructional strategy choices
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Hattie's visible Learning shows that Effective feedback has a learning effect size of 0.90, and teaching strategies at 0.60, co teaching at 0.19, class size at 0.21

Action Steps to Implement

1. identify and monitor students who comprise this subgroup
2. The master schedule will allow for additional sections of Math, creating smaller class size in the standard math classes.
3. The Exceptional Education students will receive support facilitation 5 days a week in their math and ELA class when Support is on their IEP
4.. Faculty meetings will include coaching on instructional pedagogy for struggling students highlighting effective feedback etc
5. PLC Teams will Track data in summative assessments, and use to inform instructional strategy choices

Person Responsible	Kirstie Gabaldon (kirstie.gabaldon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To narrow the gap between African American and the schoolwide scores. The data indicates that only 40% of our African American students are proficient in ELA and math.
Measurable Outcome:	The gap between our subgroups and our school wide average meeting proficiency will simultaneously raise and narrow by 3% as demonstrated by classroom grades, district and state exam scores, and FSA data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kirstie Gabaldon (kirstie.gabaldon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Identify and monitor students within this subgroup. 2. The master schedule will allow for additional sections of Math, creating smaller class size in the standard math classes. 3. Faculty meetings will include coaching on instructional pedagogy for struggling students. 4. PLC Teams will Track data in summative assessments, and use to inform instructional strategy choices
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Hattie's visible Learning shows that Effective feedback has a learning effect size of 0.90, and teaching strategies at 0.60,

Action Steps to Implement

1. identify and monitor students who comprise this subgroup
2. The master schedule will allow for additional sections of Math, creating smaller class size in the standard math classes.
3. Faculty meetings will include coaching on instructional pedagogy for struggling students highlighting effective feedback etc
4. PLC Teams will Track data in summative assessments, and use to inform instructional strategy choices

Person Responsible	Kirstie Gabaldon (kirstie.gabaldon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing ELA lowest quartile learning gains from 41% to 50%.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the learning gains of our lowest 25% by 9% in order to close the achievement gap.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matt Hodges (matt.hodges@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. The master schedule will include common PLC planning time in order to create common assessments. 2. PLC teams will create common assessments and review their data for each unit. 3. The exceptional education students will receive support facilitation 5 days a week in ELA. 4. Our FSA level 1 and 2 students will receive reading interventions in Intensive Reading, Critical Thinking and their ELA class. 5. Our Intensive Reading and Critical Thinking classes will utulize programs such as SIPPS, LLI, Wilson Rewards, and Reading Plus in order to make gains in reading.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading programs selected based on research presented by companies. PLC/planning supported by Solution Tree research and Hattie's Visible Learning. Phonics instruction has effect size of .6 and repeated reading programs .67 effect size. Consistent application of support facilitation held as best practice across the district.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The master schedule will include common PLC planning time in order to create common assessments.
2. PLC teams will create common assessments and review their data for each unit.
3. The exceptional education students will receive support facilitation 5 days a week in ELA.
4. Our FSA level 1 and 2 students will receive reading interventions in Intensive Reading, Critical Thinking, and their ELA class.
5. Our Intensive Reading and Critical Thinking classes will utulize programs such as SIPPS, LLI, Wilson Rewards, and Reading Plus in order to make gains in reading.

Person Responsible	Matt Hodges (matt.hodges@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing Math lowest quartile learning gains from 54% to 60%
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the learning gains of our lowest 25% by 6% in order to close the achievement gap.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Hensley (angela.hensley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. The master schedule will allow for additional sections of Math, creating smaller class size in the standard math classes. 2. The Exceptional Education students will receive support facilitation 5 days a week in their math class. 3. Dr. Davis, our Math Coach, will provide Professional Development to all math teachers. 4. Math teachers will utilize the online textbook and iReady to progress monitor the students. 5. The math teachers will collaborate and plan with other teachers in order to create and implement cross curricular lessons involving STEAM and Project Based Learning activities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC/planning supported by Solution Tree research and Hattie's Visible Learning. Developing creative programs including critical thinking skills and project based learning in Science and Math has an effect size of .65. Consistent application of support facilitation held as best practice across the district.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The master schedule will allow for additional sections of Math, creating smaller class size in the standard math classes.
2. The Exceptional Education students will receive support facilitation 5 days a week in their math class.
3. Dr. Davis, our Math Coach, will provide Professional Development to all math teachers.
4. Math teachers will utilize the online textbook and iReady to progress monitor the students.
5. The math teachers will collaborate and plan with other teachers in order to create and implement cross curricular lessons involving STEAM and Project Based Learning activities.

Person Responsible	Angela Hensley (angela.hensley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To cultivate a positive school culture through high expectations When clear expectations and positive relationships are present throughout a school, students and teachers are able to maintain an academic focus.
Measurable Outcome:	Out of school suspensions will decrease by 5% from last year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kirstie Gabaldon (kirstie.gabaldon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. We will create and use documents supporting a single school culture that are accessible to faculty, parents, and students alike. 2. We will implement a PBS reward system supporting single school culture expectations and character counts pillars. 3. Students will utilize planners to record homework and access rewards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Developing positive relationships is supported by Hattie's Visible Learning. Research supporting PBS can be found at https://www.apbs.org/new_apbs/researchIntro.aspx Decreasing disruptive behavior in class has an effect size of .53 and teacher/student relationships has .73 effect size.

Action Steps to Implement

1. We will create and use documents supporting a single school culture that are accessible to faculty, parents, and students alike.
2. We will implement a PBS reward system supporting single school culture expectations and character counts pillars.
3. Students will utilize planners to record homework and access rewards.

Person Responsible	Kirstie Gabaldon (kirstie.gabaldon@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.

The 8th grade math proficiency increased by 13% with the implementation of the math coach. A renewed focus on standards and instructional strategies pushed the team forward.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

The school will create a Single School Culture document that is accessible, clear, and shares expectations for stakeholders. Students will offer ideas as to what rewards will motivate their peers and PTO will work with faculty and administration to ensure ideas are shared. As school events may be limited due to the pandemic, we will communicate with stakeholders with videos, meetings online, electronic newsletters and a quarterly paper newsletter.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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