

St. Johns County School District

# South Woods Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## South Woods Elementary School

4750 SR 206 W, Elkton, FL 32033

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

### Demographics

**Principal: Angela Rodgers**

Start Date for this Principal: 11/30/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (60%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# South Woods Elementary School

4750 SR 206 W, Elkton, FL 32033

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">31%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
<b>Grade</b>		B	B	C

## 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.**

South Woods Elementary School will create a positive learning environment that will instill good character and the desire for academic excellence, fostering the development of caring, productive, and digital citizens in the global world.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

South Woods students will communicate, collaborate, and solve problems in all academic areas to a high standard. Our students will have the necessary digital skills to perform in the school/home/work place and in the global society in which they live. Students will be lifelong learners that exhibit good character and contributors to their neighborhood, community and world.

At South Woods, we believe that:

- ~ the school serves and exists to provide the best educational opportunity for all.
- ~ the best educational environment is one which makes available opportunities to practice basic skills, receive instruction in the various disciplines, use technology tools, and provide rigor in the curriculum.
- ~ the best educational opportunities allow each student to learn to his/her fullest potential.
- ~ each student should be able to learn whatever he or she is studying while demonstrating a level of mastery in all grade level standards.
- ~ efficient learning requires a planned sequence of teaching / learning experiences aimed at specific goals.
- ~ education's purpose is to help students become independent, self-directed individuals capable of achieving goals while also serving the good of society.
- ~ school must help students to increase their self-respect, respect of others, appreciation of differences, and understanding that developing good character should be a priority.

### 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
Rodgers, Angela	Principal	Staffing, Budget, School Improvement Plan, Observations, SAC & PTO member, Community Partner Cabinet, Safety Coordinator, Title One Programs, Intern/Practicum Placement, Communication Board, Eagle Update & Parent Newsletter, School Messenger & School Marquee, and Threat Assessment Team Member.
Bielefeldt, Lisa	Assistant Principal	Teacher Observations, LEA for Individual Education Plan Meetings, Intervention Meetings, 504 Plans, Professional Learning Committees, Back Bus Loop Supervisor, PMRN Testing Coordinator, iReady Testing Coordinator, Field Studies, Summer Reading Program, Safety Team Member, and Threat Assessment Team Member.
English, Dana	Administrative Support	Office Manager, General/Operating Funds, Internal Accounts, Payroll & Supplements, Timecards, Leave Requests, Master Calendar, Requisitions & Fundraising, Travel Requests, Workman's Comp/Injuries, Keys & Lanyards, Supply Requests, Receipt Books, Computer Insurance Payment, and Safety Team Member.
Cunningham, Sally	Instructional Coach	Teacher Coaching, Professional Development, Professional Learning Committee, WOW Facilitator, Deliberate Practice Facilitator, District Modules Monitor, Teacher Mentor Facilitator, SIPPS LLI DRA Expert, New Teacher Training, Spelling Bee, Tropicana Speech, and Safety Team Member.
Fuce, Linda	Other	Behavior Support/Discipline, MTSS/Rtl Behavior Plans, Tier 2 & 3 Behavior Groups, Conscious Discipline & PBIS, Social Skills Coordinator, Character Counts! Celebrations, District Dean Meetings, Bullying Investigator & Reporter, Front Bus Loop Supervisor & Safety Drills, Restraint Reporter, Safety Patrol Leaders, Safety Team Member, and Threat Assessment Team Member.
Ambrose, Diana	School Counselor	Mandated Guidance Lessons, Social/Emotional Groups, Attendance Concerns, WIDA Testing ELL Plans, Migrant Contact, Student Mentor Coordinator, Red Ribbon Week, DCF Contact, Donations Coordinator, Clothes Closet, APEX Referrals, MTSS Core Team, Holiday Support, Safety Team Member, TAT Team Member/Crisis Consultant, and Gifted Screeners.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Monday 11/30/2020, Angela Rodgers

**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.*

4



**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.*

7

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

53

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

639

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

13

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

14

**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	108	94	95	115	94	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	598
Attendance below 90 percent	25	16	16	16	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	6	8	6	16	11	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
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	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
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	6	20	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

**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	4	7	18	13	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

**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	7	19	14	24	34	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 9/1/2021

**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	105	107	125	104	98	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	641
Attendance below 90 percent	9	13	15	21	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	7	6	8	6	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	21	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	2	13	27	12	16	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
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	3	4	24	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	105	107	125	104	98	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	641
Attendance below 90 percent	9	13	15	21	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	7	6	8	6	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	21	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	2	13	27	12	16	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
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	3	4	24	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				53%	75%	57%	45%	72%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	67%	58%	36%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	59%	53%	32%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				66%	77%	63%	66%	77%	62%
Math Learning Gains				70%	69%	62%	59%	67%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	59%	51%	44%	58%	47%
Science Achievement				60%	72%	53%	42%	68%	55%

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	50%	78%	-28%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	77%	-27%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	76%	-23%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	68%	82%	-14%	62%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	82%	-19%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2021					
	2019	65%	80%	-15%	60%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	60%	73%	-13%	53%	7%
Cohort Comparison						

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

i-Ready data.

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

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

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12	18	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	4	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	19	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	17	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14	16	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4	4	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9	7	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	4	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48	30	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	13	6	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12	11	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36	17	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	17	8	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22	15	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	8	8	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25	11	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4	4	
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36	15	
Science	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	11	0	
	English Language Learners			
Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
English Language Arts	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
Mathematics	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	22	37	47	26	38	36	24				
BLK	33	27		32	38	21	22				
HSP	67			67							
WHT	48	49	50	56	49	50	56				
FRL	43	41	50	48	47	44	40				
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	48	48	39	53	52	37				
BLK	47	52		40	61		50				
HSP	41	54		71	92						
MUL	50			60							
WHT	56	62	60	74	70	59	67				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
FRL	53	63	59	66	75	63	62				
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	20	22	24	43	47	45	12				
BLK	32	31	38	47	41	42	11				
HSP	35	25		74	81						
MUL	40			50							
WHT	49	40	31	71	62	46	51				
FRL	36	31	33	62	53	43	33				

### 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	45
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	312
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

### Subgroup Data

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

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	



Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	51
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	45
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?

South Woods Elementary dropped in all areas measured on the FSA between 2018-2019 and 2020-2021. ELA Achievement went from 53% to 47%. Math Achievement went from 66% to 52%. While performing above the state averages for Levels 1-3 in ELA, Math, and Science, Levels 4 & 5 were lower.

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

The most significant gap occurred in Math Learning Gains of our Lowest 25%, (58% to 33%). The largest disparities being seen with our Students with Disabilities and Black Students.

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

Contributing factors for the need for improvement include lack of parental participation in student learning, student absenteeism, students who were distant learners, and teachers new to the school. Actions that need to be taken begin with creating a school-wide arithmetic practice system along with increasing the amount of teachers trained in Cognitive Guided Instruction (CGI) to benefit mathematical problem-solving. ESE Support Facilitation roles will be changed and resources specifically designed for students with disabilities will be used. Subgroups will be progress monitored regularly using iReady, and District Common Formative Quizzes. The progress monitoring data will be examined during weekly grade level PLCs and small reteach groups will be created to address low performing standards. Our lowest 25% will be paired with mentors to encourage attendance and engagement.

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

The ELA Achievement was the highest performing area (47%) for South Woods Elementary. The Hispanic subgroup also increased from 41% in 2019 to 67% in 2021.

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

Contributing factors for this improvement was the school-wide commitment to small group ELA instruction and all teachers earning their reading endorsement. Our Instructional Literacy Coach provided specified grade level instruction including unpacking standards and ways to increase student engagement.

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

Kagan strategies will be implemented to increase student engagement and accelerate student learning. In primary grades, subitizing will be implemented in daily instruction to improve number concepts.

#### 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 Instructional Literacy Coach provides specified grade level instruction including unpacking standards and increasing student engagement. Our teachers meet twice a week for PLCs, monthly at faculty meetings, and every seven weeks with grade levels.

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond include interventionists, scheduled target time, and implementation of highly effective programs.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** According to the 2021 FSA data, 42% of the lowest quartile students demonstrated learning gains in ELA.

**Measurable Outcome:** South Woods Elementary will increase the percentage of ELA Learning Gains with our lowest quartile from 42% to 50% in 2022.

**Monitoring:** Our ELA focus will be monitored by evaluating progress on essential standard assessments, iReady diagnostics, District Common Formative Quizzes, and Diagnostic Reading Assessments. Our FSA 2022 results will be our final indicator.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Angela Rodgers (angela.rodgers@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The evidence-based strategies being implemented for ELA include the identification of essential standards and analyzing formative assessment data from student formative & summative assessments. Creating grade level target time in daily schedules to address specific gaps in learning and provide reteach opportunities. Interventionists serve identified students on each grade level using highly effective programs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Analysis of ELA student data provides a measurable component to adjust instructional plans and student groups as needed throughout the year rather than waiting for end of the year results.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Leadership Team members will attend weekly PLCs, initiate intervention plans as needed, and make changes to Individual Education Plans to address continued challenges. Our lowest 25% will be paired with mentors to encourage attendance and engagement.

**Person Responsible:** Angela Rodgers (angela.rodgers@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

According to the 2021 FSA data, 33% of the lowest quartile students demonstrated learning gains in Math.

**Measurable Outcome:**

South Woods Elementary will increase the percentage of Math Learning Gains with our lowest quartile from 33% to 40% in 2022.

**Monitoring:**

Our Math focus will be monitored by evaluating progress on essential standard assessments, iReady diagnostics, and District Common Formative Quizzes. FSA results from 2022 will be our final indicator.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Angela Rodgers (angela.rodgers@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

The evidence-based strategies being implemented for Math include the identification of essential standards and analyzing formative assessment data from student formative & summative assessments. Creating grade level target time in daily schedules to address specific gaps in learning and provide reteach opportunities. Interventionists have created grade level arithmetic quizzes for students to gauge their mastery.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Analysis of Math student data provides a measurable component to adjust instructional plans and student groups as needed throughout the year rather than waiting for end of the year results.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Leadership Team members will attend weekly PLCs, initiate intervention plans as needed, and make changes to Individual Education Plans to address continued challenges. Our lowest 25% will be paired with mentors to encourage attendance and engagement.

**Person Responsible**

Angela Rodgers (angela.rodgers@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** According to South Woods' 2021 PBIS end of the year discipline data, there were 488 office discipline referrals that resulted in 51 days of in-school suspensions and 183 days of out-of-school suspensions.

**Measurable Outcome:** Discipline incidents will decrease by 5% in 2022 with 464 or less office discipline referrals, 48 or less days of in-school-suspensions, and 174 days or less of out-of-school suspensions.

**Monitoring:** Our Culture & Environment focus will be monitored by student discipline data. School-wide discipline responses will be tracked; support call for behavior, number of discipline referrals, number of behavior intervention plans, number of FBA/BIPS developed, in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions and transfers to more restrictive schools. Leadership Team members will discuss weekly/monthly data and make changes as needed. Conscious Discipline trainings will continue for instructional and non-instructional staff members. Participation in PBIS school-wide recognition tools- Eagle Eggs & Eagle Feathers will be monitored along with the our PBIS 2022 discipline results.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Linda Fuce (linda.fuce@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The Leadership Team members will conduct classroom observations of classroom morning meetings and social skill instruction. Each week we will discuss discipline data and make changes as needed. Conscious Discipline trainings will continue for instructional and non-instructional staff members. Participation in PBIS school-wide recognition tools- Eagle Eggs & Eagle Feathers will be encouraged. Character Counts! class representatives will be celebrated at a monthly assembly. The CC! celebration will include the award recipients, one grade level, and parents.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** School discipline data and observations will be used as measurable pieces to evaluate our implementation and the program effectiveness. We will work to decrease discipline occurrences.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Grade Level Team Leaders will provide feedback on social skill lessons and morning meetings. The Leadership Team will share school-wide discipline data each month. Supports can be provided for specific students and/or teachers as needed.

**Person Responsible:** Angela Rodgers (angela.rodgers@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** According to the 2021 FSA data, 22% of our students with disabilities made ELA achievement.

**Measurable Outcome:** South Woods Elementary will increase the percentage of ELA achievement with our students with disabilities from 22%% to 30% in 2022.

**Monitoring:** Our ELA achievement focus with students with disabilities will be monitored by evaluating progress on essential standard assessments, iReady diagnostics, and District Common Formative Quizzes. Our FSA 2022 results will be our final indicator.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Angela Rodgers (angela.rodgers@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The evidence-based strategies being implemented for ELA include the identification of essential standards and analyzing formative assessment data from student formative & summative assessments. Grade level target time has been created in daily schedules to allow for reteach opportunities and/or specific gaps in learning. ESE Support Facilitators serve students on each grade level using highly effective programs designed for students with disabilities. Leadership Team members will attend weekly PLCs and work with IEP case managers to make needed adjustments on Individual Education Plan goals or accommodations.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Analysis of ELA student data provides a measurable component to adjust instructional plans and groups as needed throughout the year rather than waiting for end of the year results.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Leadership Team members will attend weekly PLCs and work with IEP case managers to make needed adjustments on Individual Education Plan goals or accommodations. Our lowest 25% will be paired with mentors to encourage attendance and engagement.

**Person Responsible** Angela Rodgers (angela.rodgers@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safe-schools-for-alex.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.

## 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.

South Woods develops a positive school culture and environment by developing meaningful relationships with students, parents, and the community. Our 2021-2022 school-wide deliberate practice falls under the domain of Conditions for Learning, specifically focused on Establishing and Maintaining Effective Relationships in a Student-Centered Classroom. Our master schedule has time dedicated time at the beginning of each day to conduct a classroom morning meeting. To support these efforts, each teacher has been provided a Social Skills Lesson binder. The same lesson focus is delivered across our campus to develop common language and expectations.

South Woods is a Certified Community Partnership School committed to serving students and empowering families for future success. They offer free services related to wellness, counseling, student and parent supports, nutrition, social services, and more. Our on site telehealth urgent care kiosk is able to serve students, families, and staff as well.

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

Angela Rodgers, principal, and Lisa Bielefeldt, assistant principal, promote a positive culture and environment at the school by being present to greet staff, students, and families during arrival and dismissal each day. They attend weekly grade level PLCs with teachers, monthly PTO & SAC meetings, and events occurring in the community.

Linda Fuce, our school behavior interventionist, plays many roles to promote a positive culture and environment at South Woods. She provides Conscious Discipline training to our instructional and non-instructional staff members. She has also communicated PBIS expectations for the different locations around our school. South Wood Eagles SOAR! We are Safe, Organized, Accountable, and Respectful. Students may earn Eagle Eggs as a group or Eagle Feathers as individuals for following expectations. In addition to school initiatives we promote the district's Character Counts! adopted program. Lessons regarding the six character pillars are incorporated in our Social Skills/Morning Meeting Binder and monthly students exhibiting those characteristics are recognized at a celebration.

Sally Cunningham, our Instructional Literacy Coach, supports our school-wide deliberate practice by providing weekly professional development for grade levels and monthly presentations for instructional and non-instructional members. She shares and models Kagan Strategies to engage students through movement activities. Ms. Cunningham also conducts a biweekly book study on "The Morning Meeting



Book". In addition to her coaching efforts, she is a leader on our Sunshine Committee that organizes and promotes social events for our staff.