

St. Johns County School District

Patriot Oaks Academy



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	21
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	0

Patriot Oaks Academy

475 LONGLEAF PINE PKWY, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

Demographics

Principal: Drew Chiodo

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2021

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)	8%
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 (76%) 2017-18: A (77%) 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	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Patriot Oaks Academy

475 LONGLEAF PINE PKWY, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>8%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>30%</p>

School Grades History

	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Year				
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.

Committed to every student every day!

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Patriot Oaks, we are a community that fosters character development, independence and a lifelong love of learning.

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
Olson, Allison	Principal	
Carlson-Bright, Dianna	Assistant Principal	
Zamparelli, Alexis	Assistant Principal	
Wetjen, Chris	Dean	
Susice, Kim	Instructional Coach	
jensen, kylea	Teacher, K-12	
Olson, Bonnie	Teacher, K-12	
Allen, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Czubati, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
Cipolla, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	
Hiett, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Tumbelty, Allison	Teacher, ESE	
Hicks, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	
Campbell, Catie	Teacher, K-12	
giggy, danika	Teacher, K-12	
Lovett, Andrew	Teacher, K-12	
Hudson, Kathryn	Instructional Media	
Brossart, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/25/2021, Drew Chiodo

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.*

6

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

98

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,255

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

9

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	92	121	137	150	159	139	167	148	176	0	0	0	0	1289
Attendance below 90 percent	5	4	9	3	4	4	7	6	14	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	12	5	6	8	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	6
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	1	2	8	2	6	0	0	0	0	19
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	3	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	2	1	1	1	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	14

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	2	3	3	5	5	6	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	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	127	135	150	154	134	167	157	178	194	0	0	0	0	1396
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	3	1	4	5	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	9	3	8	12	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	3	9	2	7	8	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	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	2	0	2	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	11

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	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	127	135	150	154	134	167	157	178	194	0	0	0	0	1396
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	3	1	4	5	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	9	3	8	12	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	14
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	0	1	3	9	2	7	8	0	0	0	0	30
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	2	0	2	0	3	4	0	0	0	11

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		2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times		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				85%	84%	61%	84%	72%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				70%	67%	59%	68%	62%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	61%	54%	62%	62%	52%
Math Achievement				89%	88%	62%	90%	76%	61%
Math Learning Gains				74%	71%	59%	71%	65%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68%	66%	52%	69%	68%	52%
Science Achievement				77%	77%	56%	81%	73%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				93%	95%	78%	94%	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	87%	78%	9%	58%	29%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	81%	77%	4%	58%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
05	2021					
	2019	86%	76%	10%	56%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
06	2021					
	2019	84%	74%	10%	54%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
07	2021					
	2019	85%	72%	13%	52%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
08	2021					
	2019	84%	71%	13%	56%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	82%	82%	0%	62%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	85%	82%	3%	64%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2021					
	2019	93%	80%	13%	60%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
06	2021					
	2019	84%	74%	10%	55%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-93%				
07	2021					
	2019	92%	80%	12%	54%	38%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
08	2021					
	2019	83%	78%	5%	46%	37%
Cohort Comparison		-92%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	79%	73%	6%	53%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	74%	72%	2%	48%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

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	93%	90%	3%	71%	22%

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	100%	79%	21%	61%	39%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	81%	19%	57%	43%

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				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49	57	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	10	9	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	44	49	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	10	27	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61	52	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	23	19	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	39	27	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	12	8	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	85	62	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	58	26	
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52	38	
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	38	21	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	65	56	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	33	25	
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53	43	
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	25	13	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	64	42	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	64	42	
Science	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	22	9	
	English Language Learners			
Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
Science	All Students	30	17	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
English Language Arts	English Language Learners			

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

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

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

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	48	46	36	61	62	52	50	76			
ELL	58			83							
ASN	93	91		90	79		89	100	100		
BLK	67	62	50	72	81	75	64				
HSP	74	65	41	79	60	50	68	92	94		
MUL	79	68		94	73		64				
WHT	79	70	55	87	73	65	79	97	82		
FRL	64	50		76	57		70				
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	55	60	51	59	56	55	47	71	17		
ELL	55			45							

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
ASN	96	75		97	82	70	96	100	83		
BLK	61	53	36	70	61	57	58				
HSP	86	74	64	85	77	56	76	90	57		
MUL	81	76		87	86						
WHT	85	69	64	90	73	70	76	93	62		
FRL	79	74		73	78		90				
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	45	43	39	61	60	58	39	80	18		
ELL	67	73		83	85						
ASN	96	84		99	82	90	89	100	100		
BLK	74	67	50	70	64	44	64				
HSP	83	67	64	85	73	69	62	93	69		
MUL	73	63	70	83	54						
WHT	83	67	62	91	71	71	84	93	74		
FRL	75	60	56	81	63	65	76	88	86		

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	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	688
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
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	71
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	67
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	76
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	76
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	63
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?

The lowest quartile learning gains for both ELA and math are stagnant. There are years that fluctuate higher and then lower but the average is the same. ESE students continue to have the lowest gains and achievement.

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

All school data shows that ESE students have the lowest gains and achievement.

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, distance learning and quarantining have had a negative affect on learning gains and achievement for all students but especially our lowest quartile. We hope with our children returning to the building, receiving consistent intervention and face time with teachers, our learning gains and achievement will grow.

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

Our science achievement is on the rise after a couple of years showing negative results. Our biggest improvement came in MS acceleration and our attention to giving more students access to high level courses.

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

For middle school acceleration, we looked closely at each student and scores for them and looked for ways to push them into honors level courses. It was time intensive and some students are struggling but the number is small and we hope the impact will be great.

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

We will continue to build our PLC meetings to more deeply discuss data and student needs.

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.

Our school participates in systematic and on-going professional development using WOW for elementary and subs for middle school every 6 weeks. We have book studies, discuss improvement

instructional strategies, implement and reflect on what we find when we try them. The process is making our teachers better.

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

We will continue to set aside the supplemental funds budget to cover subs to allow for full day planning and learning for teachers to encourage growth and collaboration.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We have continued to make small positive steps in learning gains in ELA for our lowest quartile but took a hard hit this last year. I am certain that COVID, distance learning and quarantining played a significant role in our learning gains drop. We will refocus our energies even with the continuing quarantining that will negatively affect some students.

Measurable Outcome: We want to see a 3 point increase in learning gains for our lowest quartile and a 2 point gain in overall achievement in ELA.

Monitoring: Common formative and common summative assessments will be used on a frequent basis. We will also monitor i-Ready diagnostic three times a year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christopher Wimmer (christopher.wimmer@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: We have utilized i-Ready instruction in an after school tutoring format and have seen gains in student confidence and competence. We will put forward funds to offer this service again, specifically inviting our lowest quartile students. This tutoring program is for grades 3-8. We are also beginning an after school tutoring program for K-5, focusing on our lowest quartile, utilizing research based strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: i-Ready is individualized and works to help students fill gaps in their learning. We do not use any other computerized instructional program like this throughout our school day to help it maintain its integrity and novelty for students. The small group tutoring for K-5 is face to face with a reading endorsed teacher to help fill gaps for individual students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Determine the target groups for K-5 tutoring and i-Ready tutoring based on 1st diagnostic i-Ready and FSA scores.

Person Responsible Christopher Wimmer (christopher.wimmer@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

2. Recruit K-5, reading endorsed teachers, purchase i-Ready instructional materials, hire teachers to run the labs.

Person Responsible Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

3. Send invites to parents for both tutoring opportunities.

Person Responsible Christopher Wimmer (christopher.wimmer@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In reviewing the data, we are stagnant in our learning gains for our lowest quartile students in math.

Measurable Outcome: We will work for a 3 point rise in learning gains in math and 2 point increase in math achievement.

Monitoring: Common formative and common summative assessments and then data discussions in PLC groups. Three times a year i-Ready diagnostic will also be reviewed as another data point to notice trends.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christopher Wimmer (christopher.wimmer@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: I-Ready math instruction in an after school tutoring program for grades 4-8. Small group instruction to fill gaps in all grades.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: i-Ready creates an individualized instructional path for students that can help fill gaps and increase achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Determine a list of potential students based on i-Ready diagnostic and FSA scores. Invite attendees and hire tutors.

Person Responsible Christopher Wimmer (christopher.wimmer@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Purchase i-Ready instructional program and monitor data with testing coordinator.

Person Responsible Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Relationships are integral to students achievement and success. Our elementary resource teachers along with our middle school elective teachers are participating in Project Connect- each choosing a handful of our lowest quartile students to reach out to and build relationships with. The teams will meet monthly to share what they have learned about each of their students. We know that when students feel they have safe adults who care about them, they will do better in school.

Measurable Outcome: We hope to see a 2 point in learning gains and achievement in each student for both reading and math.

Monitoring: We will monitor the i-Ready diagnostic results and do a comparison of the FSA data for each of our students in Project Connect to see the positive impact for children.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christopher Wimmer (christopher.wimmer@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Mentoring between teacher and lowest quartile students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research shows that strong relationships with teachers builds stronger connections to school, which, in turn, increases achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify target group of students.

Person Responsible Kim Susice (kimberly.susice@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

2. Have teachers work through activity where we create lists and make assignments.

Person Responsible Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

3. Report back once per month at PLC meetings.

Person Responsible Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Learning gains and achievement in ELA for students with disabilities are significantly below the coordinating data for math. Reading is the basis for all learning and we need to put our focus on reading interventions K-8.

Measurable Outcome: We want to see a 2 point increase in achievement and a 3 point increase in learning gains to get both data points to 50, which is the district goal. Our current learning gains for our lowest quartile in ELA is 36 and needs to move up as well.

Monitoring: We will monitor with BAS, QRI and other reading assessments given quarterly to our students to monitor growth in overall reading ability for all ESE students with reading goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Allison Tumbelty (allison.tumbelty@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will actively utilize research based instructional resources in our ESE pull-out instruction groups to fill gaps and increase skills in reading so as to increase competence and confidence in our students with disabilities. These instructional resources include SIPPS, Rewards, Wilson Foundations and the like.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The new resources acquired for our ESE teachers are researched based and show the greatest learning gains in disabled students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. District training on new ESE ELA resources.

Person Responsible Dianna Carlson-Bright (dianna.carlson-bright@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

2. Full implementation of instructional resources in all ESE pull-out ELA instructional groups.

Person Responsible Dianna Carlson-Bright (dianna.carlson-bright@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

3. Quarterly monitoring of all ESE students with reading goals using BAS, QRI, etc by either ILC, classroom teacher, IR teacher or ESE teacher.

Person Responsible Dianna Carlson-Bright (dianna.carlson-bright@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.

Our school discipline data is very low in comparison to schools in our area. We work hard to utilize mentors and in school detention to keep students in school and learning. We are ranked between number 1-4 for all categories in our county- violent incidents, property incidents, drug/public order incidents and suspensions. We monitor discipline data each MTSS CORE meeting and at our weekly cabinet meetings.

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.

We work hard to show value and appreciation to each of our stakeholders. In the weekly emails to staff, there is a section for thank yous to show appreciation to different groups of people for their kindness and hard work. We have three bulletin boards that display positive daily messages that change each day. These messages were created by teachers during our pre-planning and are used to increase positive messaging throughout our school. We provide treats for teachers twice a month on our early release days to show our appreciation along with monthly breakfasts. We reward students with Good Charger tickets, bracelets, lanyards, horses and cookies weekly for being kind and working hard. We have bulletin boards in the main hallway that are covered with pictures of our Good Chargers. I meet quarterly with each team for several hours and lead professional learning for my teachers- participating myself. We laugh, take risks and learn together.

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

Team leaders are encouraged to build trust and risk-taking with their teams. They set norms and hold weekly meetings to help and support each other.

Members of our admin team are support folks for these teams. We each have three teams that we support and we attend their meetings. We do not direct the meeting; we support and problem solve.

Our parent community are an integral group of stakeholders and show support to our school by supporting their child's teacher. They actively attend conferences, volunteer when it is appropriate and provide monetary support to our school to allow us to better serve students.

Our PTO and SAC are active parent groups that fundraise and offer feedback for decisions respectively.

These parent groups volunteer much time and energy in helping us create a better school and we are grateful to them.