St. Johns County School District

Switzerland Point Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

Switzerland Point Middle School

777 GREENBRIAR RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

Demographics

Principal: Linda Carnall

Start Date for this Principal: 5/10/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	5%
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 (71%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (74%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info	rmation*
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	<u>Cassandra Brusca</u>
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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Title i Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Switzerland Point Middle School

777 GREENBRIAR RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

School Demographics

School Type and G (per MSID		2020-21 Title I Schoo	l Disadvant	Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)
Middle Sch 6-8	nool	No		4%
Primary Servi (per MSID		Charter School	(Reporte	Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)
K-12 General E	ducation	No		26%
School Grades Histo	ory			
Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		А	Α	Α

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.

Switzerland Point Middle School strives to empower all students with a passion and a curiosity for learning as well as empathy for others. Each student's strengths, talents, and creative abilities will be recognized and nurtured.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to prepare EVERY student for high school, so that all opportunities are available for every child.

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
Carnall, Linda	Principal	
Brown, Earl	Assistant Principal	
Wiggins, Sarah	Assistant Principal	
Pellicer, Leslie	Instructional Coach	Intensive Literacy Coach
Amatangelo, Miriam	Math Coach	
Patterson, Caryn	School Counselor	
Tippins, Jennifer	School Counselor	
Puckett, James	Dean	
Gibian, Kelly	Dean	
Parks, Lynda	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 5/10/2021, Linda Carnall

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.

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

67

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1 295

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

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

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	361	425	393	0	0	0	0	1179	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	50	52	0	0	0	0	132	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	24	34	0	0	0	0	74	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	15	23	0	0	0	0	63	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	11	0	0	0	0	31	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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						C	Grad	e Le	vel					Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	17	32	0	0	0	0	70

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indiantar						(Grad	e Le	vel					Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	14	12	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/6/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level														
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	388	376	528	0	0	0	0	1292	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	16	29	0	0	0	0	56	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	21	52	0	0	0	0	101	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	6	0	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	14	45	0	0	0	0	69	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	11	0	0	0	0	31	

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

Indicator						G	irac	de Le	evel					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	27	0	0	0	0	50

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level														
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	388	376	528	0	0	0	0	1292	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	16	29	0	0	0	0	56	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	21	52	0	0	0	0	101	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	6	0	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	14	45	0	0	0	0	69	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	11	0	0	0	0	31	

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

Indicator		Grade Level												Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	27	0	0	0	0	50

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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 Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State	
ELA Achievement				76%	68%	54%	80%	69%	53%	
ELA Learning Gains				60%	59%	54%	62%	57%	54%	
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	48%	47%	53%	45%	47%	
Math Achievement				87%	77%	58%	87%	76%	58%	
Math Learning Gains				74%	68%	57%	75%	66%	57%	
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69%	60%	51%	65%	58%	51%	
Science Achievement				80%	70%	51%	82%	73%	52%	
Social Studies Achievement				92%	88%	72%	92%	87%	72%	

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
06	2021					
	2019	80%	74%	6%	54%	26%
Cohort Con	nparison					
07	2021					
	2019	76%	72%	4%	52%	24%
Cohort Con	nparison	-80%				
80	2021					
	2019	74%	71%	3%	56%	18%
Cohort Con	Cohort Comparison					

	MATH											
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison						
06	2021											
	2019	74%	74%	0%	55%	19%						
Cohort Con	nparison					_						

			MATH	1		
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	85%	80%	5%	54%	31%
Cohort Com	nparison	-74%				
08	2021					
	2019	91%	78%	13%	46%	45%
Cohort Com	Cohort Comparison				•	

	SCIENCE											
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison						
08	2021											
	2019	78%	72%	6%	48%	30%						
Cohort Com	nparison											

		BIOLO	GY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	87%	13%	67%	33%
		CIVIC	S EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	93%	90%	3%	71%	22%
		HISTO	RY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
		ALGEE	RA EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	99%	79%	20%	61%	38%
		GEOME	TRY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	81%	19%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

		2021	SCHOO	DL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	33	39	35	50	57	48	29	66	14		
ELL	33	50		67	75						
ASN	86	77	60	91	78	67	90	96	84		
BLK	49	48	27	58	50	36	27	42			
HSP	60	51	46	76	68	61	50	88	52		
MUL	66	55		76	67	70	58	88			
WHT	74	57	40	81	64	54	73	90	64		
FRL	57	48	33	59	64	50	67	77	40		
		2019	SCHOO	DL GRAD	E COMP	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	30	38	34	56	58	58	44	57	19		
ASN	93	81		100	87		93	100	77		
BLK	56	54	40	75	70	71	73	88	40		
HSP	71	71	60	74	56	52	77	87	60		
MUL	71	58		82	77	64	92	92	62		
WHT	76	58	45	89	75	70	79	92	56		
FRL	59	56	30	77	64	63	72	88	33		
		2018	SCHOO	DL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	39	41	37	51	57	51	44	72	10		
ASN	94	77		99	96		91	94	77		
BLK	65	59	43	80	67	59	78	100			
HSP	74	56	45	80	78	58	74	88	46		
MUL	89	65		89	69			92			
WHT	80	62	53	87	73	66	82	92	43		
FRL	69	54	48	79	69	63	71	88	24		

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	66
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	595

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	56
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	81
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	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	69

Multiracial Students							
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%							
Pacific Islander Students							
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students							
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A						
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%							
White Students							
Federal Index - White Students	66						
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO						
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%							
Economically Disadvantaged Students							
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55						
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?

Subgroup data shows that SWD, ELL, FRL, and the Black subgroup scored lower than their peers in almost all categories. Gains were made in the area of middle school acceleration and almost all categories of our Asian subgroup. In the categories of math achievement, math learning gains and math learning gains of the lowest quartile, gains were made in the SWD and White subgroup.

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

According to the data from the 2018-19 school year, the greatest need for improvement is in the categories of learning gains in the lowest quartile for both ELA and Math across all subgroups. While the Middle School Acceleration category increased across all subgroups, there is still a need to increase in the SWD subgroup.

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

In the 2018-19 school year, we brought on 17 new teachers to the campus who were not fully trained in the PLC process. Our schoolwide DPGP is addressing using data to close the achievement gap. Through PD and PLC work days administrators and coaches will be working with teachers to support this goal and increase student achievement. ESE and General Education teachers will collaborate to intentionally plan and implement high yield strategies to meet student

needs. The MTSS team has more representation from the ESE team to assist in problem solving for our students already identified as SWD.

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

Based off of the 2019 state assessments, Middle School Acceleration increased 12 points overall from 46% to 58%.

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

We used FSA data for math course placement into accelerated math courses for students with FSA Math scores of 3 or higher. This increased the opportunity for a larger number of students to participate in accelerated math courses.

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

Through work on the school wide DPGP and work within the PLC teams, teachers will analyze data and plan intentionally to use high yield strategies and scaffold lessons to accelerate learning.

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.

Through PD sessions throughout the year we will train teachers on high yield instructional strategies to accelerate learning. PLC PD days will be utilized to assist with backward planning and intentionally planning scaffolding to accelerate learning. We will be training our staff on "Embedded Formative Assessment" which includes clarifying learning intentions, providing feedback that moves learners forward, and appropriately utilizing assessment data to drive instruction.

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 provide professional development in the PLC process, utilization of instructional coaches to facilitate PD and support teachers, and continued PD for teachers to analyze and use data to drive instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%. Students at SPMS in the lowest quartile were not making gains commiserate with gains made at the district or state level in 2020-21. Past interventions such as the addition of support facilitated ESE classes and smaller class sizes have assisted us, but were not able to mitigate the impacts of a new teaching staff in 2020-21.

Measurable Outcome:

Students in the lowest quartile, across all grade levels, at SPMS will increase achievement 50% or greater as measured by FSA school data on the May 2022 FSA test administration cycle.

Monitoring:

SPMS will utilize the i-Ready platform to monitor students in the lowest quartile. All SWD and any student with an Rtl reading plan are assessed using the QRI-6.

Person responsible

for monitoring outcome:

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidencebased Strategy:

Provide resources to address the learning needs of our lowest 25% including instructional materials, time, targeted lessons, and personnel.

1. ESE students will be able to have text read aloud during assessments and teachers will have tools to track performance and respond to data, helping students make progress with standards-based instruction and preparing for FSA test with tools similar to those on the testing platform.

Rationale for

Evidencebased

Strategy:

- 2. All ELA teachers have access to the FSA Test Prep Booklets adopted by the SJCSD.
- 3. We have Unique Skills classes formed to address our SWD specific reading deficits using Wilson Reading Systems, Rewards, and Journeys.
- 4. Provide PLC planning days to utilize the backward planning method.
- 5. Intentionally planning for addressing the needs for the students in our lowest quartile.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Purchase "Edulastic" online to increase student access for students performing in the bottom 25%.

Person Responsible

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Purchase "Performance Coach by Triumph Learning" to assist students in developing metacognitive strategies related to standards in ELA.

Person Responsible

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Hire Varying Exceptionalities ESE Paraprofessional to assist in classroom support.

Person Responsible

ble Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

4. Purchased "Embedding Formative Assessment" to help teachers utilize their formative assessments more appropriately to push the learning forward.

Person Responsible

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

5. Utilize Performance Matters to track SWD, L25, and our black subgroup data.

Person Responsible

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Last Modified: 5/17/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 16 of 21

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%. Students at SPMS in the lowest quartile were making gains commiserate with gains made at the district or state level in 2020-21. However, the gains made in the 2020-21 school year, dropped from what they have been in the past 5 years.

Measurable Outcome:

Students in the lowest quartile, across all grade levels, at SPMS will increase achievement 60% or greater as measured by FSA school data on the May 2022 FSA test administration cycle.

Monitoring:

SPMS will utilize the district preferred iReady platform to monitor students with lowest 25%. All SWD and 7th and 8th grade standard math students will be monitored with IXL.

Person responsible for

monitoring

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

outcome: Evidencebased

Strategy:

Provide resources to address the learning needs of our lowest 25% including instructional materials, time, targeted lessons, and personnel.

1.Teachers will have tools to track performance and respond to data, helping students make progress with standards-based instruction and preparing for FSA test with tools similar to those on the testing platform.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy:

- 2. ALL Math teachers have access to the OneNote with district created materials that align to the standards that include test prep materials.
- 3. We have intensive math classes formed to address math deficits using IXL for targeted practice.
- 4. Provide PLC planning days to utilize the backward planning method.
- 5. Intentionally planning for addressing the needs for the students in our L25.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Purchased IXL Math progress monitoring for students struggling in math.

Person Responsible

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

2. School Instructional Math Coach will push into standard classes to assist with small group remediation.

Person Responsible

Miriam Amatangelo (miriam.amatangelo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

3. Utilize Performance Matters to track SWD, L25, and our black subgroup data.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Improve school culture through PBIS, Restorative Practices and SEL Implementation. In August 2018, SPMS rolled out the PBIS Rewards Program and began implementation and monitoring of student behaviors. While all teachers were trained and many began implementation, school-wide data did not reveal a significant decrease in school-wide suspensions in the 2020-21 school year. While SPMS earned PBIS Model School - Gold status in the 2019-20 school year, we recognize based on discipline data (specifically data related to specific subgroups) there is more work for us to accomplish in this area.

Measurable Outcome: Students at SPMS will show a decrease in the overall suspension rate for the 2021-2 school year as compared to data in the 2018-2019, 2019-20, 2020-21 school years. In addition, we expect to see a decrease in the number of discipline referrals school-wide as well as an increase in positive feedback reported by students on annual SAC survey.

Monitoring:

The Dean's office will run monthly reports and report data to the MTSS team to reflect on our 2021-2022 goals.

Person responsible

for Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased Strategy: Provide resources to teachers and staff to support students' social emotional needs and focus on recognizing students' positive contributions while providing alternatives as teaching components when issuing consequences for actions not aligned to district code of conduct and school-wide expectations through restorative practice program.

Rationale

for Evidence-

1. Staff will be able to implement PBIS strategies.

2. Staff will have up-to-date information on best practices and receive training on SEL strategies with on-going support to assist our students.

based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

Purchase PBIS Rewards Annual Membership.

Person Responsible

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

SPMS will utilize the Character Counts Chats monthly provided by SJCSD.

Person Responsible

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

SPMS will nominate monthly character counts winners nominated by the staff for those students who demonstrate the pillar of the month.

Person Responsible

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

ESSA Subgroup data of SPMS SWDs indicate a critical discrepancy between SWD and their general education peers. While looking at the ELA Achievement data for 2020-21 school year, SWD was 33%, while the SPMS overall population was at 72%. This discrepancy identifies a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome:

SWD at SPMS subgroup scored 41% of total points which would equate to a school grade of C. SPMS will score 12% points higher for the 2021-2022 school year to equate to a school grade of B for the SWD subgroup data.

Monitoring:

SPMS will utilize the district preferred iReady platform to monitor SWD. All SWD are assessed using the QRI-6, as well as all the students that have an RTI plan for reading.

Person responsible for

monitoring outcome:

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidencebased Strategy:

Provide resources to address the learning needs of our SWD including instructional materials, time, targeted lessons, and personnel.

Rationale for

1. ESE students will be able to have text read aloud during assessments and teachers will have tools to track performance and respond to data, helping students make progress with standards-based instruction and preparing for FSA test with tools similar to those on the testing platform.

Evidencebased Strategy:

- 2. We have Unique Skills classes formed to address our SWD specific reading deficits using Wilson Reading Systems, Rewards, and Journeys.
- 3. Provide PLC planning days to utilize the backward planning method.
- 4. Intentionally planning for addressing the needs for the SWD.

Action Steps to Implement

Hire Varying Exceptionalities ESE Paraprofessional to assist in classroom support.

Person Responsible

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Utilizing our MTSS team to monitor/problem solve on behalf of our SWDs.

Person Responsible

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Utilizing the CAST team of SJCSD to review our school based summative to ensure they align appropriately.

Person Responsible

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Utilizing the ILC at SPMS to provide specific strategies to teachers to help close the achievement gap.

Person Responsible

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#5. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The school will create a team of teacher leaders who are exploring the book "The Will to Lead, the Skill to Teach" and will assist our teachers in beginning to explore issues of equity as access as they relate to both academic and non-academic areas within the school.

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.

SPMS committed to a focus of promoting a positive school culture. The teachers intentionally used the first 10 days to create a positive school environment through reviewing school and classroom expectations and creating rituals and routines. Lessons were created to ensure the school expectations were explicitly taught the in same manner so all students heard the same message. Teachers intentionally planned activities during the first 10 days to build relationships with the students and create a positive classroom environment.

SPMS has a WEB (Where Everyone Belongs) Program with a class for the WEB leaders. WEB leaders visit 6th grade classrooms weekly during homeroom and participate in lessons and activities to assist students in

adjusting to middle school and create a positive environment. WEB leaders also organize community service projects that the whole student body can participate in.

Through PBIS students can be recognized daily by teachers and other staff members for their positive contributions to the school environment. Students receive "Raider Bucks" for their good deeds, that can be used to purchase items from the Raider Store.

Each month teachers are given the opportunity to recognize students who demonstrates the traits associated with the Character Counts! pillar of the month. Those students are called down and recognized with certificate and a free meal ticket to PDQ. Their names our also displayed on the Character Counts! bulletin board.

This year our staff participated in creating Collective Commitments to guide our work during the year. In an effort to encourage relationship building within our staff, we implemented a practice of introducing a few staff members per week via email, that provides an opportunity to share information about their personal life in which we may not have time for otherwise.

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

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.

SPMS PTSO holds bimonthly Raider Buck stores for our students who earn Raider Bucks through our PBIS system. PTSO also provide grants for teachers to purchase materials for projects that increase engagement and student learning. PTSO assists in organizing activities to bring the school community together, such as dances, and events in which parents can come together.

Jen Schwall organizes our monthly Character Counts! recognition program. Kelly Gibian assists and creates the bulletin board to promote the good deeds of these students to the entire school. Our business partner (PDQ) contributes the meal cards to the Character Counts! recipients.

Michele Cohen runs our WEB program in which she trains the leaders, provides lessons throughout the year and organizes community building activities. Miriam Amatangelo and Michele Cohen run the 6th grade camp which is a 2 day camp that assists 6th graders in their transition to middle school.

Leslie Pellicer, Earl Brown, Jennifer Tippins, Caryn Patterson, and Lynda Parks visit all feeder elementary schools to build relationships with rising 6th graders and their families. They assist in registration, answering questions and building a sense of community before the transition happens.

Kelly Gibian and James Puckett, dean of students, work with students to correct behaviors and provide positive reinforcement.