

St. Johns County School District

The Evelyn Hamblen Center



2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 7 |
| Planning for Improvement | 12 |
| R.A.I.S.E | 0 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |

The Evelyn Hamblen Center

1 CHRISTOPHER ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

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

Demographics

Principal: Craig Davis

Start Date for this Principal: 10/19/2021

| | |
|--|---|
| 2021-22 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Function (per accountability file) | ESE |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School KG-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Special Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | |
| School Improvement Rating History | 2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: Unsatisfactory 2018-19: Maintaining 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: Maintaining |
| DJJ Accountability Rating | 2023-24: No Rating |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns County School Board.

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Transition School is a therapeutic day school designed to serve ESE students with significant emotional and behavioral needs, enrolled in grades K-12, up to 22 years of age. These students have been unsuccessful in a behavior unit and require additional behavioral support for success. Transition also serves students who transfer to St. Johns County from a similar program or a residential program.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The primary goal of The Transition School is to stabilize student behavior through intensive behavioral coaching, mental health counseling, psychiatric care, case management services, and individualized academic instruction so that these students may transition to a less-restrictive academic placement.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

The Transition School works with students with significant emotional and behavioral needs by striving to stabilize their behavior through intensive behavioral coaching, mental health counseling, psychiatric care, case management services, and individualized academic instruction so that these students may transition to a less-restrictive academic placement.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Davis, Craig | Principal | |
| Norwich, Melisa | Assistant Principal | |
| Lo, Tiffany | Instructional Coach | |
| Rule, Kristopher | Dean | |

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 10/19/2021, Craig Davis

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

10

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

13

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

44

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

4

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

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 41 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 21 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 22 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |

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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 12 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/1/2021

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

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

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

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 78% | -78% | 58% | -58% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 77% | -77% | 58% | -58% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 76% | -76% | 56% | -56% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 74% | -74% | 54% | -54% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 72% | -72% | 52% | -52% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 71% | -71% | 56% | -56% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 75% | -75% | 55% | -55% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 74% | -74% | 53% | -53% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 82% | -82% | 62% | -62% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 82% | -82% | 64% | -64% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 80% | -80% | 60% | -60% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 74% | -74% | 55% | -55% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 80% | -80% | 54% | -54% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 78% | -78% | 46% | -46% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 73% | -73% | 53% | -53% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 72% | -72% | 48% | -48% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 90% | -90% | 71% | -71% |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

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 | 27 | | 20 | 20 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 23 | | | 17 | | | | | | | |
| 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 | 17 | 9 | | 17 | 40 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 20 | | | 21 | | | | | | | |
| 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 |

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 | 22 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| 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 | 89 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 4 |
| Percent Tested | 83% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 22 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |

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

| Native American Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| 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 | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 20 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the Areas of Focus?

The Transition School serves only students with disabilities. Data for subgroups within this population are not available due to the relatively small enrollment per grade level and the transitory nature of the students (who are ideally only temporarily enrolled). Overall, per iReady and Achieve 3000 data, students tend to be performing below grade level due to the tendency of their behavior to obstruct their learning.

Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The Transition School serves only students with disabilities. Data for subgroups within this population are not available due to the relatively small enrollment per grade level and the transitory nature of the students (who are ideally only temporarily enrolled). Overall, per iReady and Achieve 3000 data, students tend to be performing below grade level due to the tendency of their behavior to obstruct their learning.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

The previous school rating of Maintaining dropped to Unsatisfactory due to a significant drop in FSA math learning gains (from 38% to 23%).

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Overall, per iReady, Achieve 3000, and FSA data, students tend to be performing below grade level, which is largely due to the tendency of their behavior to obstruct their learning.

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

An instructional coach is providing individualized support to teachers in order to strengthen instruction. An adaptive PE coach is providing a structured PE experience to students in order to channel their emotions more productively, and a district mental health counselor is providing one-on-one and group support to students.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development is driven by the Gaines professional learning community. Through the regular collaboration of this team, student and teacher needs are continually addressed. Improvement of teaching and learning techniques is also facilitated by the instructional coach.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#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.

In order for Transition students to step down to a less-restrictive placement successfully, they need to be proficient in their ELA skills.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Learning gains of the lowest 25% will reach 50% or increase by 2% if above 50%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

ELA performance data gained through iReady and Achieve 3000 will be monitored for student progress. Transition PLC teams will collaborate with the use of real-time data to gauge student growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffany Lo (tiffany.lo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

iReady and Achieve 3000 are research-based programs, designed to generate data valuable for instructional planning. The Transition teams will function as professional learning communities, meeting regularly to troubleshoot student performance concerns.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

iReady and Achieve 3000 are research-based programs, designed to generate data valuable for instructional planning. Ongoing team collaboration in supporting student progress is a research-based strategy for improving student success. The PLC model is a district-wide initiative for strengthening student learning.

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.

The Transition teams will function as a PLC to foster student progress.

Person Responsible

Melisa Norwich (norwicm@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Remediation will be provided as needed.

Person Responsible

Melisa Norwich (norwicm@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

#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.

In order for Transition students to step down to a less-restrictive placement successfully, they need to be proficient in their math skills.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Learning gains of the lowest 25% will reach 60% or increase by 2% if above 60%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Math performance data gained through iReady will be monitored for student progress. Transition PLC teams will collaborate with the use of real-time data to gauge student growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffany Lo (tiffany.lo@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

iReady is a research-based program, designed to generate data valuable for instructional planning. The Transition teams will function as professional learning communities, meeting regularly to troubleshoot student performance concerns.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

iReady is a research-based program, designed to generate data valuable for instructional planning. Ongoing team collaboration in supporting student progress is a research-based strategy for improving student success. The PLC model is a district-wide initiative for strengthening student learning.

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.

The Transition teams will function as a PLC to foster student progress.

Person Responsible

Melisa Norwich (norwicm@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Remediation will be provided as needed.

Person Responsible

Melisa Norwich (norwicm@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

A critical goal for Transition is to reduce the number of Professional Crisis Management restraints of students in crisis.

Measurable Outcome:
 State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Transition will reduce the number of PCM restraints for the current school year by 10%, compared to the number of restraints for the 2020-21 school year.

Monitoring:
 Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The de-escalation team will meet weekly to address current restraint trends.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Coleen Wysocki
 (coleen.wysocki@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The de-escalation team will function as a professional learning community to collaborate on how best to shape student behaviors in ways that prevent student crises, thereby rendering restraint unnecessary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Ensuring that students are successfully progressing to less-restrictive environments, when possible, is critical to their long-term success, both behaviorally and academically. This is a well-established outcome for students with disabilities.

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.

The de-escalation team will meet weekly to address current PCM restraint trends and collaborate on how best to shape student behaviors in ways that prevent student crises, thereby rendering restraint unnecessary.

Person Responsible Melisa Norwich (norwicm@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

The Transition teams will provide noncontingent positive experiences to students at least biweekly.

Person Responsible Melisa Norwich (norwicm@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:
 If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The primary goal of Transition is to stabilize students' behavior so that they may step down to a less-restrictive placement.

Measurable Outcome:
 State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Transition will improve its successful step-down rate by 10% for the current school year.

Monitoring:
 Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The leadership team will monitor student progress reports from receiving schools to gauge student success in their new placements.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melisa Norwich (norwicm@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Receiving schools will communicate how students are progressing in their new placements so that we may collaborate with these teams to foster student success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Ensuring that students are successfully progressing to less-restrictive environments, when possible, is critical to their long-term success, both behaviorally and academically. This is a well-established outcome for students with disabilities.

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.

The leadership team will obtain student progress reports from receiving schools.

Person Responsible Melisa Norwich (norwicm@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

The leadership team will collaborate with receiving school teams to foster student success in their new placements.

Person Responsible Melisa Norwich (norwicm@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:
 If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

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.

The Transition School remains in an ongoing state of collaboration across a broad spectrum of stakeholders in order to shape student emotions and behavior so that they may avoid entering into states of crisis. This spirit of working together for the purpose of student success in moving to less-restrictive environments drives a school culture that is based on hope and resilience. The professional learning community model, couched within a climate of emotional intelligence, is the foundation of our effectiveness.

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

Each member of the Transition team plays a critical role in cultivating a student-focused culture: the teachers, the behavior specialist, the mental health counselor, the dean, the instructional coach, the youth resource deputy, the administrative team, the St. Augustine Youth Services team, and outside agency support as needed. Continual collaboration with parents is critical to our success, as the emotional and behavioral needs that we are addressing are also usually prevalent in the home. Especially because of this, we need to be pursuing a partnership with parents as we strive to prepare students for less-restrictive environments.