Mill Creek Academy

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mill Creek Academy

3750 INTERNATIONAL GOLF PKWY, St Augustine, FL 32092

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

Demographics

Principal: Kenneth Goodwin

Start Date for this Principal: 8/3/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	20%
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 (65%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (66%)
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

Mill Creek Academy

3750 INTERNATIONAL GOLF PKWY, St Augustine, FL 32092

http://www-mce.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)
Combination School KG-8	No	16%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

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 Mill Creek we will inspire students to be lifelong learners with integrity.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Learning community of Mill Creek will ensure that ALL achieve their fullest potential through challenging, purposeful learning opportunities where life-long learning becomes a passion!

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
Goodwin, Kenneth	Principal	The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures professional development to support programs, and communicates with parents regarding overall school progress. In addition, the principal works collaboratively with the leadership team to analyze student data through a cycle of continuous improvement to ensure all students receive services and supports they need to grow socially, emotionally, and academically. Furthermore, the principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build school-wide capacity to better serve our students.
Miller, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures professional development to support programs, and communicates with parents regarding overall school progress. In addition, the assistant principal works collaboratively with the leadership team to analyze student data through a cycle of continuous improvement to ensure all students receive services and supports they need to grow socially, emotionally, and academically. Furthermore, the assistant principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build schoolwide capacity to better serve our students.
Stackhouse, Stacy	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures professional development to support programs, and communicates with parents regarding overall school progress. In addition, the assistant principal works collaboratively with the leadership team to analyze student data through a cycle of continuous improvement to ensure all students receive services and supports they need to grow socially, emotionally, and academically. Furthermore, the assistant principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build schoolwide capacity to better serve our students.
Ottosen, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures professional development to support

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		programs, and communicates with parents regarding overall school progress. In addition, the assistant principal works collaboratively with the leadership team to analyze student data through a cycle of continuous improvement to ensure all students receive services and supports they need to grow socially, emotionally, and academically. Furthermore, the assistant principal works with the building leadership team to provide ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build schoolwide capacity to better serve our students.
Kelley, Crystal	Instructional Coach	The ILC develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. The coach identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with the whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for students considered "at risk"; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring, and is the facilitator of the MTSS team. The ILC plans and provides ongoing, job-embedded professional development to support our instructional staff.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/3/2021, Kenneth Goodwin

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.*
5

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.*
14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
102

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,695

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
25

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	154	181	163	165	156	197	180	207	182	0	0	0	0	1585
Attendance below 90 percent	8	4	7	9	1	19	15	14	27	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	6	16	13	20	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	2	22	11	17	22	0	0	0	0	74
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	2	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	2	0	9	0	8	9	19	0	0	0	0	47

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	3	6	8	3	5	4	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	39
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

Tuesday 8/3/2021

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	143	158	149	153	148	183	163	193	168	0	0	0	0	1458
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	6	5	1	3	5	0	10	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	3	9	4	11	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	1	6	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	143	158	149	153	148	183	163	193	168	0	0	0	0	1458
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	6	5	1	3	5	0	10	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	3	9	4	11	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	1	6	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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				73%	84%	61%	75%	72%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				70%	67%	59%	67%	62%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	61%	54%	61%	62%	52%
Math Achievement				74%	88%	62%	77%	76%	61%
Math Learning Gains				64%	71%	59%	72%	65%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	66%	52%	57%	68%	52%
Science Achievement				73%	77%	56%	78%	73%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					95%	78%		85%	77%

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	69%	78%	-9%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	77%	1%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	76%	76%	0%	56%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
06	2021					
	2019	69%	74%	-5%	54%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
08	2021					

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	75%	82%	-7%	62%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	80%	82%	-2%	64%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2021					
	2019	71%	80%	-9%	60%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
06	2021					
	2019	61%	74%	-13%	55%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
07	2021					
	2019	100%	80%	20%	54%	46%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-100%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	72%	73%	-1%	53%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019					

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	44	48	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	22	39	
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28	37	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	11	22	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53	51	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	20	23	
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26	24	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	17	13	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	74	52	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	45	33	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	34	24	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	19	12	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	58	43	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	27	19	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	45	32	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	37	21	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50	32	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	14	7	
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51	32	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	11	4	
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	32	38	36	40	41	35	25	40			
ASN	76	74		86	70		58	82	82		
BLK	53	61		46	41		54				
HSP	66	59	32	72	53	40	63	86	75		
MUL	70	48		78	81		53	88			
WHT	70	62	47	75	64	50	67	78	78		
FRL	64	52	47	58	59	40	60	75			
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	38	51	43	48	53	38	43				
ASN	86	88		91	81						
BLK	63	73		68	75						

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
HSP	73	73	40	71	68	58	76				
MUL	80	83		80	75		90				
WHT	72	68	58	73	61	46	70				
FRL	64	71	52	66	65	55	70				
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	38	50	38	52	54	35	50				
ASN	73	64		93	79						
BLK	70			80							
HSP	80	69		73	70	58	69				
WHT	74	66	57	77	72	54	80				
FRL	58	50	43	59	62	50	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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	586
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	75
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	51
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	61
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	70
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	66
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	57
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?

Our lowest 25th percentile learning gains and proficiency are below their peers. Our lowest 25th percentile is mostly comprised of ESE students. There is a similar trend with the ESE/SWD subgroup data.

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

Students in the lowest 25th percentile and ESE/SWD subgroup consistently underperform when compared to their peers. These groups of students have the greatest need for improvement.

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

We must ensure our students receive a guaranteed and viable curriculum with appropriate supports in the least restrictive environment. We will review our inclusive practices, collaborative practices, and co-teaching strategies to ensure we are meeting the needs of our students who are struggling academically.

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

4th grade ELA proficiency and 7th grade math proficiency saw growth compared to progress monitoring data.

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

Contributing factors include collaborative team planning, appropriate curricular resources, and improved teacher practices.

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

Teams will meet collaboratively to review student performance data during cycles of inquiry. Teams will incorporate acceleration strategies into their lessons to accelerate the learning of 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.

Inclusion training, co-teaching training, acceleration strategies, Professional Learning Communities training, data analysis training, common formative and summative assessment training, B.E.S.T standards training, and training based on our newly adopted curricular resources.

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

We are working to create a collaborative environment where teachers work in teams to review student performance data, develop strategic lesson plans, implement the lessons, evaluate the

effectiveness of the lessons, refine lessons and re-implement to accelerate student learning. This culture will be how we operate this year as well as in the future to meet the needs of our students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our learning gains for our bottom quartile in ELA are one of the lowest areas of performance. Grade-level teams will implement differentiated instructional strategies to meet the specific needs of students to accelerate their learning. Grade-level (collaborative teams) will plan and implement standards-based differentiated lessons planned, implement, and monitored through the PLC process.
Measurable Outcome:	MCA will increase the bottom quartile learning gains in ELA by 6% to reach 50% as measured by the FSA this school year. We will increase the learning gains in grades K-2 by 2% as measured by iReady this school year.
Monitoring:	Student performance will be monitored through common formative assessments (CFA), iReady data, Common Focus Quizzes (CFQ), and summative assessments. Collaborative teams will analyze student performance through ongoing cycles of inquiry and make appropriate adjustments to accelerate the learning for all students, in particular our bottom quartile.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will work collaboratively to identify essential standards, create SMART goals, create and utilize common formative assessments, plan standards-based units/lessons, implement the lessons, monitor student performance, and make timely adjustments. Teams will meet weekly throughout the year in ongoing cycles of inquiry.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The collaborative teaming process through ongoing cycles of inquiry are research-based strategies enabling teachers to accelerate the learning of students.

Action Steps to Implement

Create time throughout the week to enable teachers to plan collaboratively.

Person Responsible Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Person Responsible Crystal Kelley (crystal.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Person Responsible Crystal Kelley (crystal.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our learning gains for our bottom quartile in math are one of the lowest areas of performance. Grade-level teams will implement differentiated instructional strategies to meet the specific needs of students to accelerate their learning. Grade-level (collaborative teams) will plan and implement standards-based differentiated lessons planned, implement, and monitored through the PLC process.
Measurable Outcome:	MCA will increase the bottom quartile learning gains in math by 2% to reach 52% as measured by the FSA this school year. We will increase the learning gains in grades K-2 by 2% as measured by iReady this school year.
Monitoring:	Student performance will be monitored through common formative assessments (CFA), iReady data, Common Focus Quizzes (CFQ), and summative assessments. Collaborative teams will analyze student performance through ongoing cycles of inquiry and make appropriate adjustments to accelerate the learning for all students, in particular our bottom quartile.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will work collaboratively to identify essential standards, create SMART goals, create and utilize common formative assessments, plan standards-based units/lessons, implement the lessons, monitor student performance, and make timely adjustments. Teams will meet weekly throughout the year in ongoing cycles of inquiry.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The collaborative teaming process through ongoing cycles of inquiry are research-based strategies enabling teachers to accelerate the learning of students.

Action Steps to Implement

Create time throughout the week to enable teachers to plan collaboratively.

Person Responsible	Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Person Responsible	Crystal Kelley (crystal.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Teams work through ongoing cycles of inquiry during collaborative planning with the ILC, Testing Coordinator, and administrative team.

Person Responsible	Crystal Kelley (crystal.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students with disabilities is one of our lowest performing subgroups. The students in this subgroup are also in our bottom quartile for ELA and math.

Measurable Outcome:	Students with disabilities will reach 50% proficiency and learning gains in ELA and math as measured by the FSA this school year. Students with disabilities in K-2 will increase performance and gains by 2% measured by iReady.
Monitoring:	Student performance will be monitored through common formative assessments (CFA), iReady data, Common Focus Quizzes (CFQ), and summative assessments. Collaborative teams will analyze student performance through ongoing cycles of inquiry and make appropriate adjustments to accelerate the learning for all students, in particular our students with disabilities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will work collaboratively to identify essential standards, create SMART goals, create and utilize common formative assessments, plan standards-based units/lessons, implement the lessons, monitor student performance, and make timely adjustments through ongoing cycles of inquiry.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The collaborative teaming process through ongoing cycles of inquiry are research-based strategies enabling teachers to accelerate the learning of students.

Action Steps to Implement

Create time throughout the week for general education and ESE teachers to plan collaboratively.

Person Responsible	Kenneth Goodwin (kenneth.goodwin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A consistent behavioral intervention program throughout the school and all grades is important to develop lifelong learners who make responsible choices.
Measurable Outcome:	We will reduced behavioral incidents by 5% by the end of the 2021-22 SY.
Monitoring:	Our PBIS team review monthly behavior data in eSP.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacy Stackhouse (stacy.stackhouse@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilize PBIS and Character Counts as the foundational approach to behavioral interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS and Character Counts are research-based programs that have demonstrated over time to be effective with students.

Action Steps to Implement

Ongoing PBIS training will be provided to committee members who will share the strategies with their colleagues.

Person Responsible	Stacy Stackhouse (stacy.stackhouse@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Create consistent behavioral expectations throughout school and train teachers.

Person Responsible	Stacy Stackhouse (stacy.stackhouse@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Meet monthly to review data. Make adjustments as needed. Review behavioral expectations at strategic points throughout the school year and conduct in-depth refreshers for students with behavioral challenges.

Person Responsible	Stacy Stackhouse (stacy.stackhouse@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.

Our PBIS team will monitor student behavioral data monthly and make adjustments with the program as needed.

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.

Stakeholder input and communication is a priority at MCA. We gather their input formally and informally through surveys, conversations, emails, meetings, and committees (School Advisory Council - SAC, PTA).
Our SAC and Team Leaders review student data and all aspects of our school and develops our school improvement plan (SIP). Since we do not have end-of-year state performance data, we will review our most recent data and gather new data at the beginning of this year to refine our SIP to meet the needs of all students.
Through ongoing input and monitoring of school-wide data, the SAC and Team Leaders will offer recommendations and adjustments that need to be made to improve the quality of instruction.
In addition, our Best Practices for Inclusive Education (BPIE) Committee will meet to review ESE data and practices to make recommendations to ensure MCA provides an inclusive environment for students receiving ESE services.

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

BPIE Committee - Inclusive practices
SAC - Shared decision making, review school improvement plan
PTA - Connecting school and community, conducting events to support students and families
Team Leaders - Collaborate and shared decision making to ensure students receive the highest level of education.
PBIS Committee - shared decision making regarding school-wide positive behavioral program