Port St. Joe Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Port St. Joe Elementary School

2201 LONG AVE, Port St Joe, FL 32456

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Duane Mcfarland

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	77%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Gulf County School Board on 9/8/2022.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Port St. Joe Elementary School

2201 LONG AVE, Port St Joe, FL 32456

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	77%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	31%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		C	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Gulf County School Board on 9/8/2022.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brock, Jessica	Principal	
Daniels, Anna	Other	
Patterson, Jacqueline	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Duane Mcfarland

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Total number of students enrolled at the school

530

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

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
13

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	87	65	60	76	66	76	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	508
Attendance below 90 percent	26	23	19	25	19	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	2	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	5	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	6	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	11	24	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	5	2	2	2	6	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	12	3	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/30/2022

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	49%	49%	56%				53%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%						47%	48%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						33%	37%	53%
Math Achievement	56%	53%	50%				47%	49%	63%
Math Learning Gains	60%						40%	48%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						27%	38%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	55%	59%				59%	46%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	62%	53%	9%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	46%	3%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	44%	42%	2%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
06	2022					
	2019	52%	53%	-1%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	65%	55%	10%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	54%	52%	2%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2022					
	2019	37%	39%	-2%	60%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
06	2022					
	2019	33%	47%	-14%	55%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	57%	46%	11%	53%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

Subgroup Data Review

| **2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	29	50	53	31	51	50	43				
BLK	25	32		30	44						
HSP	57	53		68	82						
MUL	38	38		43	31						
WHT	53	61	62	59	61	54	59				
FRL	39	51	47	46	51	50	50				
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	29	33	38	30	30				
BLK	40	40		28	47						
HSP	58	62		67	62						
MUL	44			25							
WHT	54	55	40	56	41	42	56				
FRL	42	49	33	40	44	43	43				
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	28	25	26	37	39	29					
BLK	34	28	12	16	10						
HSP	40	43		40	36						
MUL	31	43		25	50						
WHT	59	51	42	55	45	34	65				
FRL	44	41	34	38	34	27	51				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	379
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	65
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	38
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Overall, across all grade levels, proficiency levels in ELA trended downward. In looking at the data further, fourth grade had the greatest decline in proficiency rate. Fifth grade had the greatest increase in proficiency rate. In regard to ELA, student learning gain data was reflective of overall proficiency rate data in grades four and five.

In math, overall, student proficiency levels are trending upward. However, it is noticeable that in third grade, proficiency rates are continuing to trend downward.

In regard to subgroups, it is noticeable that our Black and Multiracial subgroups continue to not meet the minimum 40% proficiency rate requirement.. However, our students with disabilities are consistently trending upward in regard to student proficiency rates.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Across grade levels there are several noticeable trends. Third grade, overall, is trending downward in both ELA and Math in regard to proficiency. Fourth grade is trending downward in ELA proficiency, as well. Our Black and Multiracial subgroups are performing significantly below proficiency level.

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

In the 2021-2022 school year, we adopted a new ELA curriculum. This curriculum did not arrive until the end of October. We feel that this effected implementation of the new, BEST Standards. Therefore, this is likely a contributing factor to decreased proficiency rates in third and fourth grade ELA scores. There was also a teacher change in the middle of the year in fourth grade ELA. In regard to third grade math, we believe that the confusion around common core instructional practices in this particular subject area likely cased a decrease in student proficiency rates.

in the 21-22 school year, we had --- Black students and --- Multiracial students. Our subgroups,

compared to our overall student population, are significantly smaller. Therefore, by targeting these students specifically, we believe we will make great gains.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our students with disabilities, improved from 33% proficient to 48% proficient. The students in the lowest quartile in math went from 40% making learning gains to 53% making learning gains. Overall, in math, learning gains went from 45% to 60%. Fifth grade ELA proficiency rates increased from 46% to 54%.

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

For our students with disabilities, we continue to place them in their least restrictive environment. We utilize a support facilitation model with these students which includes a certified ESE teacher in the classroom along with the regular education classroom in effort to best support these students in their LRE.

In the 21-22 school year, we specifically targeted our lowest quartile students in the area of mathematics. The students identified as being lowest quartile were pulled, weekly, for targeted math interventions. We were able to increase the number of lowest quartile students being pulled for interventions due to having a full time math interventionist.

We have had consistent and strong fifth grade ELA teachers who responded to the data and made adjustments to instructions and interventions as needed.

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

We need to focus, as a school, on targeted small group instruction using the progress monitoring data consistently. Data communication across all stakeholders is going to be a key component to meeting individual student needs. Also, we need to implement scaffolded instruction into our daily lessons.

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.

For the 22-23 school year, we have half days built in monthly to serve as professional development time. During these scheduled days, we plan to have our District Instructional Coaches provide professional development in the area of targeted small group instruction, use of data, and instructional strategies (scaffolding), etc.

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

In effort to ensure sustainability of improvement, we will continue consistently monitor data and make instructional decisions based off of the data trends. Also, we have to maintain our instructional intervention positions in order to target our students who are struggling.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Third grade ELA proficiency rates and continued to decline since 2019. In 2019 62% of students were proficient and in 2022 48% were proficient.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	At least 55% of our students in grade 3 will demonstrate proficiency on the 2023 FAST Assessment in ELA.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	STAR Reading FAST
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Brock (jbrock@gulf.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	On going progress monitoring (data chats, STAR, etc.) Additional Support (Title I Tutoring, Pull out support for tier 2 and tier 3 students) New Benchmark Reading Curriculum and Professional Development
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	By continuing to monitor student progress, teachers will be able to adjust their instruction accordingly, based on individual student need. Additional support will be provided to our students who struggle the most in effort to ensure they make necessary learning gains. The implementation of the new Benchmark Reading Curriculum will ensure that students are being taught standards based instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. The STAR program will be utilized to progress monitor students in ELA and Math. This data will be used to drive instruction and instructional supports.
2. Students who's state testing and progress monitoring show that they are performing below grade level, will be pulled for interventions in the specific area of need.
3. Teachers will be provided two professional development days that will address the new ELA Benchmark Curriculum to ensure we are effectively teaching to the standards.

Person Responsible	Jessica Brock (jbrock@gulf.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Fifth grade math proficiency rates have not exceeded 44% since 2016.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	At least 54% of fifth grade students will demonstrate proficiency on the FAST Math.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	STAR FAST
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Brock (jbrock@gulf.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	On going progress monitoring (data chats, STAR, etc.) Additional Support (Title I Tutoring and pull out for struggling math students, support facilitation) New Benchmark Reading Curriculum and Professional Development
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	By continuing to monitor student progress, teachers will be able to adjust their instruction accordingly, based on individual student need. Additional support will be provided to our students who struggle the most in effort to ensure they make necessary learning gains. The implementation of the new Big Ideas Best Math Curriculum will ensure that students are being taught standards based instruction.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. The STAR program will be utilized to progress monitor students in Math. This data will be used to drive instruction and instructional supports.
2. Students who's state testing and progress monitoring show that they are performing below grade level, will be pulled for interventions in the specific area of need.
3. Teachers will be provided with professional development that addresses targeted small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Jessica Brock (jbrock@gulf.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our African American students are only demonstrating 33% proficiency on the state standardized tests. In 2021-2022 school year 39% of this subgroup demonstrated mastery.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	At least 40% of African American students will demonstrate mastery on the 2022-2023 FAST Assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	STAR FAST
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	On going progress monitoring (data chats, STAR, etc.) Additional Support (Title I Tutoring, Pull out support for tier 2 and tier 3 students) New Benchmark Reading Curriculum and Professional Development New Big Ideas Math Curriculum
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	By continuing to monitor student progress, teachers will be able to adjust their instruction accordingly, based on individual student need. This will allow us to target this particular subgroup of students. Additional support will be provided to our students who struggle the most in effort to ensure they make necessary learning gains. The implementation of the new Benchmark Reading Curriculum will ensure that students are being taught standards based instruction.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. The STAR program will be utilized to progress monitor students in ELA and Math. This data will be used to drive instruction and instructional supports.
2. Students who's state testing and progress monitoring show that they are performing below grade level,

will be pulled for interventions in the specific area of need.

3. Teachers will be provided with professional development that addresses targeted small group instruction.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	78 students in the 21-22 school year were absent 18 or more days.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	In the 2022-2020 there will be less than 60 students absent 18 or more days.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Attendance data through FOCUS Truancy Officers
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Brock (jbrock@gulf.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Parent communication Attendance data meetings Communication with Truancy Officer
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	With Hurricane Michael in 2018 and Covid in 2019, attendance has become a chronic issue for our school. We want to develop a plan to increase attendance.
Action Steps to Implement List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.	

1. Attendance data monitoring every month
2. Weekly check ins with Truancy Officer
3. Incentive Program

Person Responsible   Jessica Brock (jbrock@gulf.k12.fl.us)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

In grades K-3 in the 21-22 school year, we only had 23% of our students not on track to score a level a three.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

In looking at the data, third and fourth grade students did not have at least 50% of students scoring a level three on the ELA Assessment.

We are going to fully implement the new Benchmark Curriculum that is aligned to the new standards.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Maintain at least 54% proficiency on FAST ELA.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Increase student proficiency rates on the FAST ELA to at least 50%.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Tier one students--FAST three times a year
Tier two students-- STAR and fluency once a month
Tier three students-- Star once a month and fluency checks twice a month

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brock, Jessica, jbrock@gulf.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Benchmark Reading Curriculum

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Recommendation by district reading coach

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
1. Literacy Leadership Team Meetings 2. District Coach will provide professional development to teachers 3. We will be monitoring STAR and FAST data	Brock, Jessica, jbrock@gulf.k12.fl.us

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

At Port St. Joe Elementary School we have students of the week, accelerated reading incentives, gold cards as academic incentives, etc.

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

Administrators, teachers, guidance counselor, support staff