Port St. Joe Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Port St. Joe Elementary School

2201 LONG AVE, Port St Joe, FL 32456

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Duane Mcfarland

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	77%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Gulf County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Port St. Joe Elementary School

2201 LONG AVE, Port St Joe, FL 32456

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Gulf County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Port St. Joe Elementary School strives to be a school where children are challenged to learn beyond today and for life. We are committed to the idea of helping each child learn, to achieve his/her greatest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Port St. Joe Elementary School envisions the family, the school, and the community working together in a cooperative effort to create a safe learning environment enriched with enthusiasm and respect with a common mission- our students.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McFarland, Duane	Principal	Principal, Port St. Joe Elementary School Director of School Safety, Gulf County

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/2/2021, Duane Mcfarland

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.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
38

Total number of students enrolled at the school
496

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	68	59	77	67	78	71	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	496
Attendance below 90 percent	33	33	27	19	21	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	174
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	20	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	18	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	13	20	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	1	1	0	8	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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 9/24/2021

2020-21 - 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	53	73	67	72	62	68	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	473
Attendance below 90 percent	4	10	3	3	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	0	1	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	6	3	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	53	73	67	72	62	68	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	473
Attendance below 90 percent	4	10	3	3	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	0	1	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	6	3	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				53%	50%	57%	52%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	48%	58%	43%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	37%	53%	27%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				47%	49%	63%	52%	59%	62%
Math Learning Gains				40%	48%	62%	44%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				27%	38%	51%	23%	33%	47%
Science Achievement				59%	46%	53%	58%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	62%	53%	9%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	46%	3%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	42%	2%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
06	2021					
	2019	52%	53%	-1%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	65%	55%	10%	62%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	52%	2%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	37%	39%	-2%	60%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
06	2021					
	2019	33%	47%	-14%	55%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	57%	46%	11%	53%	4%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

i-Ready

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21%	38%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16%	28%	60%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2			
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	33%	53%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	17%	28%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3			
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	42%	55%	61%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	20%	14%	51%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4			
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	36%	38%	37%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	9%	31%	51%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5			
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	15%	27%	48%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	18%	35%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30%	31%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18%	31%	48%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	32	38	29	33	38	30	30				
BLK	40	40		28	47						
HSP	58	62		67	62						
MUL	44			25							
WHT	54	55	40	56	41	42	56				
FRL	42	49	33	40	44	43	43				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	28	25	26	37	39	29					
BLK	34	28	12	16	10						
HSP	40	43		40	36						
MUL	31	43		25	50						
WHT	59	51	42	55	45	34	65				
FRL	44	41	34	38	34	27	51				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	28	44	29	27	35	21	36				
BLK	27	41	32	32	28	22	31				
HSP	35	33		40	53						
MUL	50	42		39	8						

			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
WHT	59	44	22	58	50	21	72				
FRL	43	43	30	44	39	24	49				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	345
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	35
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	49
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

*Lowest 25% in ELA (5th &), Math (5th) & Science (5th) needs improvement
*3rd grade ELA meeting high standards was good (61%)
*Math achievement in proficiency is low in higher standards 4th-5th grade
*Overall learning gains low in math (5th 36%) and 5th grade 39%

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA and Math lowest 25%(4th-5th)

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Covid-19 behind hurricane Michael in 2018 which caused a loss of numerous days of school two years in a row

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA learning gains in lowest quartile
Math high standards went from 47 to 52

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

"Cares" Money paid for teachers planning period so teachers could pull struggling students to give extra work on areas of weakness

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Math- Pacing guides, rearranging weaker strands to be covered earlier in the year and revisited again
ELA- New curriculum "Benchmarks"

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Math coach pulls math teachers and reviews data/standards that need more attention. Teachers adjust their lessons to teach these standard at an earlier time of the year and then revisits these standard again later in the year (example: Math/geometry).

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Adding extra time to intensive reading classes

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2021 FSA results, our students in grades 5-6 showed lower than projected learning gains in English Language Arts. 42% of our lowest performing students (25%) showed learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	At least 53% of our students in grades 4-6 will demonstrate learning gains on the 2022 FSA in English Language Arts.
Monitoring:	Progress Monitoring through I-Ready.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Duane McFarland (dmcfarland@gulf.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Ongoing Progress Monitoring -Title 1 Tutoring -Tier II and III support for low performing students -Professional development -Increasing push in SWD in ELA courses
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies were selected to ensure that teachers and admin are monitoring student progress and adjusting instruction to meet the needs of our low performing students.

Action Steps to Implement

1.IReady will be utilized by all teachers to review and reinforce ELA standards and progress monitor student performance- Data will be reviewed continuously by teachers and monthly in grade level meetings.
2.Students in grades 1-6 will participate in the Accelerated Reader Program.
3.All teachers are utilizing focus calendars outlining implementation and transition from the FL standards to the BEST standards and progression through the Benchmark Learning curriculum, IReady, as well of the test specifications for the FSA.
4.The progress of students who scored below grade level on the beginning of the year IReady diagnostic in grades K-6 (also FLKRS for grade K) and students who scored a level 1 or 2 on the 2021 FSA in grades 4-6 will monitored monthly to identify supports needed.
5.Title 1 tutoring will be open to low performing students.
6. Continuous professional development in providing reading instruction across the curriculum and scaffolding.

Person Responsible	Duane McFarland (dmcfarland@gulf.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based upon the 2021 FSA results, our students in grades 3-6 showed a lower than projected learning gains in mathematics. 45% showed learning gains, and 44% of our lowest preforming students (25%) showed learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	At least 62% of our students will make learning gains and at least 51% of lowest performing students will make learning gains on the 2022 FSA in Mathematics.
Monitoring:	Progress Monitoring through Iready.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Duane McFarland (dmcfarland@gulf.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Ongoing Progress Monitoring -Title 1 Tutoring -Tier II and III support for low performing students -Professional development -Increasing push in SWD in Math courses
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies were selected to ensure that teachers and admin are monitoring student progress and adjusting instruction to meet the needs of our low performing students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. IReady will be utilized by all teachers to review and reinforce Math standards and progress monitor student performance- Data will be reviewed continuously by teachers and monthly in grade level meetings.
2. Reflex Math will be utilized by all teachers to review and reinforce skills.
3. All teachers are utilizing focus calendars outlining implementation and transition from the FL standards to the BEST standards and progression through the Pearson Envision mathematics curriculum, as well of the test specifications for the FSA.
4. The progress of students who scored below grade level on the beginning of the year IReady diagnostic in grades K-6 (also FLKRS for grade K) and students who scored a level 1 or 2 on the 2021 FSA in grades 4-6 will monitored monthly to identify supports needed.
5. Title 1 tutoring will be open to low performing students.
6. Continuous professional development in providing reading instruction across the curriculum and scaffolding.

Person Responsible	Duane McFarland (dmcfarland@gulf.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students possessing two or more of the EWS indicators are at risk of dropping out or not acquiring levels of proficiency while remaining in school. As of September of the 2021-22, we have 26 students who have 2 or more EWS indicators. The most common indicator included low performance on the FSA and attendance.
Measurable Outcome:	50% of the high risk EWS students will reduce to moderate risk by the end of the 21-22 school year as reported in the FL Reports in FOCUS.
Monitoring:	Progress Monitoring through FOCUS.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Duane McFarland (dmcfarland@gulf.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Ongoing progress monitoring -Title1 tutoring -Tier II and III support for low performing students -Address chronic absences -School/Parent Consultation
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies were selected to ensure that teachers and administrators are monitoring student progress and identifying supports to meet the needs of our students with 2 or more EWS indicators.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The progress of students with 2 or more EWS indicators will be monitored monthly to identify academic supports needed.
2. Title 1 tutoring will be offered to at risk students.
3. "Attendance Works" approaches, strategies, and tools will be implemented to address chronic absences.
4. Quarterly meetings with parents of our 6th grade students identified with 2 or more EWS indicators.

Person Responsible	Duane McFarland (dmcfarland@gulf.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Based on the data given, PORT ST. JOE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL-0051 reported 0.2 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. No need to monitor this discipline data.

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.

Expectations from principal to staff was addresses on the first day of school. This was followed by discussions on school improvement. All staff has bought into the belief that by studying data and applying an intense preparation to help students master the standards is necessity to achieve 62% of total applicable points in the school grading process.

One ELA coach and one Math data analysis/coach was hired to break down and identify FSA scores and to meet with teachers on ways to improve lessons.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Principal, Assistant Principal, Principal Designee, SRO, Guidance Counselor & School Secretary.
It is critical that every

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	$0.00

4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00