

St. Johns County School District

Julington Creek Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	0

Julington Creek Elementary School

2316 RACE TRACK RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-jce.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Joy Reichenberg

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	18%
2020-21 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: A (79%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (78%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 St. Johns 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Julington Creek Elementary School

2316 RACE TRACK RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-jce.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	17%
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		A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns 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.

At JCE, we will provide quality instruction in core academics as well as additional opportunities for enrichment related to the arts, technology and overall wellness. We will emphasize character education and recognize children who demonstrate qualities of good character both at school and in the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

JCE...where children grow to be well-rounded people of character, innovative and college/career ready.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Murphy, Jeanette	Principal	
Ciliberti, Ashley	Assistant Principal	
Hillenbrand, Donna	Instructional Coach	
Johnston, Dana	Teacher, K-12	
Adams, Angela	Teacher, K-12	
Barrett, Karin	Teacher, K-12	
Gilbert, Wendy	Teacher, K-12	
Lewis, Lisa	SAC Member	
Larson, Alice	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Joy Reichenberg

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

49

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

57

Total number of students enrolled at the school

904

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

7

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

8

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	101	137	148	173	158	180	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	897
Attendance below 90 percent	4	5	4	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	2	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	2	1	10	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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

Wednesday 8/25/2021

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				86%	75%	57%	85%	72%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				77%	67%	58%	62%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				78%	59%	53%	62%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				89%	77%	63%	88%	77%	62%
Math Learning Gains				78%	69%	62%	74%	67%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	59%	51%	75%	58%	47%
Science Achievement				80%	72%	53%	84%	68%	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	83%	78%	5%	58%	25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	85%	77%	8%	58%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2021					
	2019	87%	76%	11%	56%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	87%	82%	5%	62%	25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	85%	82%	3%	64%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
05	2021					
	2019	90%	80%	10%	60%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	79%	73%	6%	53%	26%
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 data.

Fall = percent of students Early on Grade Level or above.

Winter = percent of students Mid On Grade Level or above.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46	43	84
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	15	7	
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31	29	70
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	13	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48	49	82
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	23	7	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37	28	81
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	23	14	
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	75	61	96
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	53	33	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	28	91
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	20	7	

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69	57	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	25	19	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55	43	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	30	14	
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54	34	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	19	6	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61	38	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	26	6	
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	59	57	54	71	39	47	41				
ELL	71			76							
ASN	91			94			92				
BLK	46			46							
HSP	75	68		85	64	55	65				
MUL	79			93							
WHT	86	68	57	91	61	58	78				
FRL	73	39		73	28		67				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	65	59	54	78	66	61	41				
ELL	64			82	70						
ASN	88	94		96	88						
BLK	78	88		67	53		77				
HSP	75	70	65	82	72	65	65				
MUL	69			92							
WHT	89	77	82	91	80	65	82				
FRL	69	65	55	75	58	48	67				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	71	58	60	71	67	69	42				
ELL	55	75		73	75						
ASN	97	74		100	84		93				
BLK	86	53		83	82						
HSP	75	66	52	82	69	68	69				
MUL	78	82		94	73						
WHT	86	60	63	88	74	76	89				
FRL	76	54	50	77	61	67	68				

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	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	92
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	591
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	80
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	92
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	69
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	86
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	71
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	56
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?

SWD had the lowest proficiency and learning gains.

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

Greatest need for improvement is science proficiency within the SWD subgroup.

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

There was a greater focus on ELA & Math learning gains through PLC and interventions/reteach. New actions include PLC planning and scheduling science frontloading through ESE teachers.

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

Bottom 25 quartile increased 16 percent in ELA learning gains.

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

Continue with consistent reading interventions provided by a certified reading teacher/interventionist in addition to regular instruction, reteaching and ESE intervention services (if applicable). This occurs during the school day.

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

New phonics instruction in K-2. Interventions using research based instructional materials for all students.

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.

Professional development for the phonics program and intervention curriculum.

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

In addition to what we have in place, after school reading instruction will begin in October.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: The data reflects that learning gains in our bottom 25 population are the lowest.

Measurable Outcome: Learning gains of the lowest 25% will increase by 2%.

Monitoring: Monitored through iReady, DRA and essential standards assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Strategies being implemented are phonics reading interventions and consistent small group reteach and frontloading on essential reading comprehension standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data reflects gaps in the area of phonics with many of our bottom 25 students. Data also reflects that whole group instruction is not enough for these students, therefore consistent small group instruction and frontloading focussing on the essential ELA comprehension standards was chosen as a strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers have been trained this summer on our new phonics program. Continue monitoring teacher needs and professional development through our 6-weeks professional development cycle.

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

Monitor iReady, DRA and formative assessment data. Teachers will reteach through small group focusing on specific phonics skills and essential standards.

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

Teachers will plan with their teams and identify essential standards using new state standards as well as identify skills and vocabulary that need to be frontloaded.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: The data reflects that learning gains in our bottom 25 population are the lowest.

Measurable Outcome: Learning gains of the lowest 25% will increase by 2%.

Monitoring: Monitored through iReady and essential standards assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Strategy being implemented is consistent small group reteach and frontloading on essential math standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data reflects gaps within math strands with many of our bottom 25 students. Data also reflects that whole group instruction is not enough for these students, therefore consistent small group reteach and frontloading focussing on the essential math standards was chosen as a strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor iReady and formative assessment data. Teachers will reteach through small group focusing on specific skills and essential standards.

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

Teachers will plan with their teams and identify essential standards using new state standards as well as identify skills and vocabulary that need to be frontloaded.

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

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Social emotional learning in conjunction with character counts was identified based on current student needs.

Measurable Outcome:

Based on ABC data collected, students will show an increase in displaying appropriate character traits and using strategies to identify mood/behaviors and finally independently implement a strategy to defuse or change the behavior or mood.

Monitoring:

ABC data will be reviewed during RtI meetings every 5-6 weeks. Adjustments in lessons and strategies will occur as appropriate.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:

Along with our guidance counselor, resource teachers and classroom teachers will incorporate morning meetings, character building lessons, strategies for students to learn to identify their mood and behaviors as well as take an active role in choosing the appropriate strategy to change the behavior and/or mood.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Students need additional exposure to these strategies and lessons throughout the day within different environments so they become a routine in their lives.

Action Steps to Implement

Guidance counselor and administration trained all teachers including resource (art, stem, PE, music ,media) and provided expectations on social emotional and character lessons embedded in each of their classes.

Person Responsible

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

Monitor students every six weeks using ABC data (as applicable) and observations. The team monitoring consists of teachers, guidance, administration, and mental health counselor.

Person Responsible

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

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The data reflects that 77% of our 5th grade students demonstrated proficiency in science. 41% of SWD students demonstrated proficiency in science. There is a 36% gap between the two scores.

Measurable Outcome: SWD 5th grade science proficiency will increase 9 points to 50%.

Monitoring: Area of focus will be monitored through common formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers and ESE teachers will frontload science vocabulary to SWD before the initiation of each science lesson. Additional exposure will assist with comprehension and build their prior knowledge.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: SWD students scored well in reading which means the lower scores in science are attributed to lack of science knowledge. Increasing their knowledge in science vocabulary will increase their science comprehension.

Action Steps to Implement

Frontload science vocabulary through small group sessions.

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

ESE teachers and general education teachers meet throughout the year to collaborate on lessons and science goals.

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

Monitor growth through formative assessments.

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

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

The data reflects that our school falls under the moderate ranking showing physical attacks as the primary concern and bullying/intimidation as the secondary concern. These areas will be monitored and addressed through weekly Rtl Core meetings. School culture and environment will be monitored also through behavior data reviewed in weekly Rtl Core meetings as well as student participation in character building and social/emotional lessons.

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.

The school continues to build a positive school culture and environment through ongoing professional development, recognition, proactive communication with families, support for families and staff in need, providing volunteer opportunities to our families, and continuing to pull resources to assist with every need that comes our way including social emotional needs.

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

Stakeholders impact our positive school culture. They are actively involved in the following ways: PTO/SAC meetings and community events/activities involving business partners, building our Outdoor Classroom with our feeder highschool, Family Bingo, Staff Appreciation week and ongoing staff and student recognition activities through the school year.