

St. Johns County School District

Crookshank Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Crookshank Elementary School

1455 N WHITNEY ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

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

Demographics

Principal: Patrick Roach

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (56%) 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan 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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Crookshank Elementary School

1455 N WHITNEY ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

School Grades History

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

The Mission of the St. Johns County School District is to inspire good character and a passion for lifelong learning in all students, creating educated and caring contributors to the world.

The Mission of John A. Crookshank Elementary School: Our professional learning community at John A. Crookshank Elementary School is dedicated to the development of students' academic, social, and emotional well-being. We will plan purposeful lessons and instruct standards using best practices, so all students are equipped with a growth mind-set and the skills necessary to address and overcome challenges they may face in their future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

John A. Crookshank Elementary School faculty and staff members believe working together, we all succeed.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Roach, Patrick	Principal	Patrick Roach is responsible for the maintaining a safe and orderly learning environment for all students, implementation of school-wide instruction for students, the school's budget, hiring of instructional and non-instructional personnel, the School Improvement Plan, PTO, School Advisory Council, building and maintaining community partnerships, and teacher observations. MTSS/RtI 2nd - 3rd. PLC 2nd -3rd
Thomas, Christi	Assistant Principal	Christi Thomas is responsible for serving as the LEA for PK-2nd Grade, MTSSS/RtI for PK-1st Grade, PLC K-1, Teacher Observations, Textbooks, Intern Placements, overseeing the Principal's Math Club, and overseeing the Summer Reading Program. School Safety, Paraprofessionals
Garner-Kling, Gwendolyn	Assistant Principal	Gwen Kling is responsible for serving as the LEA for 3rd-5th Grade, MTSSS/RtI for 4th -5th Grade, PLC 4th - 5th, Teacher Observations, Assignment of Duties to Staff, School Schedules, Data Collection and Disaggregation, Coordinate the 5th Grade Awards Ceremony, and oversee the Summer Reading Program. School Safety Drills, Title I Representative
Orta, Adriana	Instructional Coach	Adriana Orta is responsible for Teacher Coaching, Staff Professional Development, assist with Testing, Support the PLC process by meeting weekly with Grade Level Teams, Curriculum Support, LLI & SIPPS Trainer, Facilitate and Coordinate the Spelling Bee and Tropicana Speeches. She also coordinates and ensures fidelity with the MTSS process.
Johnson, Joelle	Instructional Coach	Joelle Johnson is responsible for Teacher Coaching, Staff Professional Development, assist with Testing, Support the PLC process by meeting weekly with Grade Level Teams, Curriculum Support, LLI & SIPPS Trainer, Facilitate trainings for Schoology & Performance Matters, and Coordinate the Spelling Bee and Tropicana Speeches
Benoit, Bailey	School Counselor	Bailey Benoit is responsible for 504 Plans, FAST/FCAT NGSS Testing, CELLA/ESOL Testing, Classroom Guidance Lessons, Mental Health-Social/Emotional Groups for students, Parent Resource-Migrant/Caretakers, Oversee Food 4 Kids programs, K-Kids, Holiday Food/Gifts for Families, Community Outreach-DCF/CHS, Attendance Concerns and Celebrations.
Acs, Tara	Behavior Specialist	Tara Acs is responsible for the School-wide Discipline, overseeing the Character Counts! Program, PBIS Lead, Threat Assessment/CRISIS Team Lead, MTSS/RtI Behavior Plans, Bullying Reports, Cafeteria Supervision for Lunch, Bus Arrivals/Dismissals.
Martin, Anna	Psychologist	Anna Martin is responsible for the collecting and analyzing evaluation data for students and interpreting the results for educators and parents during IEP meetings and for MTSS Meetings, as well as academic and behavior

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		intervention for students on Rtl plans. She also serves on the IEP and MTSS/Problem Solving team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Patrick Roach

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

Total number of students enrolled at the school

704

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

4

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

14

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	104	101	95	107	100	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	612
Attendance below 90 percent	22	20	18	17	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	5	2	5	4	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	17	27	32	38	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	1	5	19	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/8/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	116	119	88	115	105	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	661
Attendance below 90 percent	30	17	19	13	20	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	7	8	2	7	12	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
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	7	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	6	4	5	12	16	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	5	11	16	17	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	116	119	88	115	105	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	661
Attendance below 90 percent	30	17	19	13	20	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	7	8	2	7	12	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
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	7	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	6	4	5	12	16	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	5	11	16	17	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	60%	74%	56%				50%	75%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	60%						50%	67%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						44%	59%	53%
Math Achievement	64%	50%	50%				57%	77%	63%
Math Learning Gains	60%						50%	69%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						40%	59%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	77%	59%				50%	72%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	55%	78%	-23%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	77%	-32%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	52%	76%	-24%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	65%	82%	-17%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	82%	-33%	64%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	80%	-23%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	50%	73%	-23%	53%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	36	38	32	46	46	33	24				
ELL	8			42							
BLK	39	44	44	51	45	42	20				
HSP	42	53		48	65		58				
MUL	67			73							
WHT	70	67	52	71	65	48	58				
FRL	53	56	48	61	61	48	48				

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	35	46	68	47	44	33	20				
ELL	39			50							
BLK	35	42		40	21	21	4				
HSP	53	70		56	50		45				
MUL	70			40							
WHT	70	66	67	76	64		51				
FRL	48	44	47	53	39	30	21				
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	16	28	36	28	38	40	17				
ELL	33			67							
BLK	32	37	37	39	44	35	25				
HSP	51	62		63	59		69				
WHT	57	51	47	62	48	38	58				
FRL	42	46	41	49	48	42	46				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
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	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	25

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	70
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

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

In the area of ELA, the gains of our SWD have continued to decrease. Over a four year timeline and 3 testing data points, there has been a 10 point decrease. (42 down to 32). In the area of math, SWD had an 8 point decrease from 2019 (41) to 2022 (33).

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

Areas of growth: SWD ELA Learning Gains dropped 8 points, from 46 to 38. ELA Learning Gains L25 dropped 36 points, from 68 to 32. Overall ELA Learning Gains dropped 18 points, from 68 to 50. Math Learning Gains L25 dropped -8 points, from 41 to 33.

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 to the decline in ELA gains could be the adoption of a new Reading/ELA curriculum. Many teachers were not fully comfortable with the implementation of the new curriculum. The PLC process was not fully established for each grade level which slowed the exchanging of data analysis, instructional strategies and best practices to meet the needs of all students. The ESE support facilitation schedules and support did not return the results as we expected. For the 2022-2023 school year, a greater emphasis will be placed on fully implementing and improving on our school wide PLCs. In our PLCs, teachers will discuss curriculum based assessments, district assessments and state progress monitoring to help determine student and subgroup needs. We are focusing on a school wide Deliberate Practice Plan that specifically addresses PLC planning and the use of data. For most teachers, this will be year two of instruction using the ELA curriculum.

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

The most improved area was our Grade 5 Science score, with an increase of 13 points, from 37 to 50. Other areas of improvement were Math Learning Gains for our African American students, increasing 24 points from 21 to 45 as well as an increase for our Hispanic students, from 50 to 65. Also, Math Learning Gains of our African American students in the Lowest 25, increasing from 21 to 42.

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

Teachers received professional development on working with students in small groups for math instruction. Students were also given access to a diagnostic, individual computer program to address

deficits and fill in learning gaps. Moving forward in PLCs, teachers will implement instructional strategies based on data and discuss next steps for individual and groups of students. A greater administrative focus on monitoring Tier 2 small group instruction and the use of specific researched based interventions to meet the needs of students. A school wide refresher on the RtI process, the use of uniform math assessments and how to best determine the specific learning deficit. In addition, at 3rd - 5th, we will implement and put emphasis on AVID strategies that have the greatest impact on student learning.

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

Classroom Teachers, Reading Interventionists and ESE Support Facilitators will meet regularly. Students will continue to receive small group instruction in areas of need to accelerate the learning. Grade 3 - 5 teachers will analyze data using district developed CFQ's. Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond. A continued focus on implementing a fully functional school wide PLC program. Teachers using and implementing reading and math pathways for instruction. As well as analyzing the data and implementing the next steps for individual and groups of students. A greater administrative focus on monitoring SWD groups, Tier 2 & Tier 3 small group instruction and the use of specific interventions to meet the needs of 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.

Teachers will receive PD on Instructional groupings using state progress monitoring data, district created CSA as well as common grade level formatives and summatives. Teachers will receive training on the use of Lexia Core, a web based program that specifically targets the Reading needs of students who are below grade level. We will deliver reading services to our students with disabilities that are more specific and intentional, based on grouping them according to their instructional Reading level. PD will be offered for BAS. We will actively monitor our ESE and intervention schedules in an attempt to give us the greatest return on investment.

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

Student progress will be closely monitored by administration and small groups will be adjusted to meet the needs of students. Each grade level will flexibly group students in order to more specifically and intentionally address areas of deficit.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. 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.**

We experienced a noticeable decline in our SWD scores, specifically ELA Learning Gains and Learning Gains of our L25. In addition, our SWD subgroup's proficiency is still below our expectation. The 41% threshold.

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

The measurable outcome for our SWD ELA Learning Gains is an increase of 5 points 32 - 37.

The measurable outcome for our SWD ELA Learning Gains in L25 is an increase of 5 points, from 33 - 38.

The measurable outcome for our SWD ELA Proficiency is an increase of 4 points, from 36 - 40.

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

We will actively monitor our desired outcomes through our MTSS Core team, administrative discussions with CES Instructional Literacy Coaches and Reading Interventionists, as well as data and student specific discussions in grade level PLC. We have also scheduled two purposeful and strategic data chat sessions with every teacher this year. Our ILC and Reading Interventionist will hold consistent data meetings with the ESE department. We will include the use state progress monitoring assessment as part of our data discussions.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

The use of research based reading/phonics programs: Heggerty, Lexia Core, SIPPS, Leveled Literacy Intervention and Wilson. The use of adopted ELA curriculum as advised. The use of a consistent PLC format that includes looking at data to determine the instructional strategies needed to meet the needs of individual students and groups of students.

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

We selected the above reading/phonics programs because they have been thoroughly vetted and are researched based. We have a strong belief that the PLC process adds instructional and collegial value to grade level teams as well as individual teachers. The sharing of instructional best practices based on data in turn impacts the quality of instruction our students receive.

**used for selecting
this strategy.**

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.

We will conduct consistent and focused data conversations about our subgroup of SWD. This will take place via grade level PLC, ESE Department meetings, Individual teacher data chats, MTSS Core and Administration Team meetings - Patrick Roach, Christi Thomas, Gwen Kling, Adriana Orta and Joelle Johnson

Person

Responsible

Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

As with our SWD subgroup, we saw a similar decline in the learning gains and ELA proficiency from our ELL students.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

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

The measurable outcome for our ELL ELA Learning Gains is an increase of 5 points, from 42 to 47.

The measurable outcome for our ELL ELA Learning Gains is an increase of 4 points, from 53 to 57.

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

We will actively monitor our desired outcomes through our MTSS Core team, administrative discussions with CES Instructional Literacy Coaches and Reading Interventionists, as well as data and student specific discussions in grade level PLC. We have also scheduled two purposeful and strategic data chat sessions with every teacher this year. Our ILC and reading support staff will regularly meet with teachers who have ELL students in their classrooms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

The use of research based reading/phonics programs: Heggerty, Lexia Core, SIPPS, Leveled Literacy Intervention and Wilson. The use of a consistent a PLC format that looks at data to determine the instructional strategies needed to meet the needs of individual students and groups of students. We will also work with the our district ELL support to share best practices and strategies with our classroom teachers. ELL students will participate in additional small group tutoring.

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

We selected the above reading/phonics programs because they have been thoroughly vetted and are researched based. We have a strong belief that the PLC process adds instructional and collegial value to grade level teams as well as individual teachers. The sharing of instructional best practices based on data in turn impacts the quality of instruction our students receive.

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.

We will conduct consistent and focused data conversations about our subgroup of ELL. This will take place via grade level PLC, ESE Department meetings (if applicable), Individual teacher data chats, MTSS

Core and Administration. Students will be part of tutoring groups to meet their specific needs. Team meetings - Patrick Roach, Christi Thomas, Gwen Kling, Adriana Orta and Joelle Johnson.

Person Responsible Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

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

To improve on the practice of our PLC process, specifically in the area of data analysis to guide the selection of instructional strategies and grouping of students to meet specific needs.

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

Our measurable outcomes will be on overall improvement of ELA Proficiency from 60 to 64
 Our measurable outcomes will be on overall improvement of ELA Learning Gains from 60 to 63
 Our measurable outcomes will be on overall improvement of ELA Learning Gains of L25 from 50 to 55
 Our measurable outcomes will be on overall improvement of ELA Learning Gains of SWD from 32 to 37

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

We will actively monitor our desired outcomes through our MTSS Core team, administrative discussions with CES Instructional Literacy Coaches and Reading Interventionists, as well as data and student specific discussions in grade level PLC. We have also scheduled two purposeful and strategic data chat sessions with every teacher this year. Our ILC and Reading Interventionist will hold consistent data meetings with the ESE department. PLC Teams have been asked to submit their PLC agenda with clear expectations of what should be discussed. They will also use a data tracking template for grouping students. Admin and ILC will be active participants in the PLC meetings.

Person
responsible
for monitoring
outcome:

Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

The use of a consistent PLC format that looks at data to determine the instructional strategies needed to meet the needs of individual students and groups of students. The discussion of research based instructional strategies in PLC and use of strategies will help teachers and teams streamline their instruction.

Rationale for
Evidence-
based

We have a strong belief that the PLC process adds instructional and collegial value to grade level teams as well as individual teachers. The sharing of instructional best practices based on data in turn impacts the quality of instruction our students receive.

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

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.

We will conduct consistent and focused data conversations about all of our students, but we will have an added focus on our SWD, Tier 2 & Tier 3 students. This will take place via grade level PLC, ESE Department meetings, Individual teacher data chats, MTSS Core and Administration Team meetings. Scheduling times during PLC to give teachers the opportunity to observe colleagues implementing prescribed strategies. - Patrick Roach, Christi Thomas, Gwen Kling, Adriana Orta and Joelle Johnson.

Person Responsible Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback/Walkthroughs**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Through teacher discussions, teacher feedback and climate surveys, specific and meaningful feedback was an area of need and improvement.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

The leadership team has been tasked with being present in classrooms throughout the year. We will do this through the formal EEE evaluation process, ELA focused walkthroughs with feedback, informal walkthroughs in all classrooms with feedback and collaborative data focused chats with individual teachers. The admin team will divide the instructional staff, rotating so we all get an opportunity to formally observe each faculty member. We will track our increased presence in classrooms.

Monitoring:

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

The admin team will consistently discuss classroom visits, walkthroughs and observations to leverage our areas of classroom support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

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

The administrative team will use the Marzano model for our formal teacher observations. Each year we conduct Instructional Rounds with district staff in an effort to verify inter-rater reliability, what we are observing in the classroom, as well as how we are scoring based on the Marzano rubric. We will also use an ELA/Reading district walkthrough template to monitor the instructional strategies, instructional delivery and use of instructional materials.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

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

We are using the Marzano model because it is researched based with specific areas of focus, a rubric/description of expectations and a uniform method of delivering teacher feedback.

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 has been tasked with being present in classrooms throughout the year. We will do this through the formal EEE evaluation process, ELA focused walkthroughs with feedback, informal walkthroughs in all classrooms with feedback and collaborative data focused chats with individual teachers. We will track our increased presence in classrooms. The admin team, Patrick Roach, Gwen Kling and Christi Thomas, will be responsible for implementing this action step.

Person Responsible Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Improving school-wide culture and climate

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

Through faculty/staff conversations and surveys, parents surveys and discussions with our PTO, it was determined that continuing to improve our overall culture and climate was needed and important to our school community.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve.

- Decrease Tier 1 behaviors and keep students in class
- Reduce the number of office discipline referrals
- Increase the number of students who participate in our quarterly reward celebrations
- Increase the number of peer recognitions between faculty and staff members

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

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

In admin and MTSS Core meetings, we will actively discuss the discipline and positive award data to help us make purposeful decisions in regard to our desired outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tara Acs (tara.acs@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy

We will use the evidence based positive behavior strategies from the PBIS program, including a positive incentive tracking sheet for all students. Our School Counselor and ESE/SEL teachers will use daily lessons to support the school wide expectations and help build classroom communities. K-2 classroom teachers will be encouraged to use Conscious Discipline in their classrooms and during their daily morning meetings. Our Behavior Support team will work with teachers to assist them with appropriate responses to disruptive behaviors. All teachers will be encouraged to support the school wide

being implemented for this Area of Focus.

behavior guidelines for success. PAWS - Personal Best, Act Responsibly, Work Together, Show Respect. We will promote a positive Culture and Climate through the six pillars of Character Counts!

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

CES will continue to build on our established PBIS plan to decrease administrative involvement in classroom management and decrease the loss of instructional time due to Tier 1 behaviors. When used with fidelity, Conscious Discipline was selected because it is a researched based program proven to bring behavioral and social/emotional success. Character Counts! is a highly successful global program encouraged by the district and embraced by CES.

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.

Throughout the year, we will recognize positive behavior of both students and teachers.

- * Cougars with Character

- * PAWS celebration

- * We Love You Wednesday for faculty and staff

- * Faculty and Staff Peer Recognition - You've Been Caught ROARing!

- * Monthly Faculty and Staff - Early Release Host Wednesdays - Potlucks

The Leadership Team will be responsible for discussing and monitoring data.

Person

Responsible

Christi Thomas (christi.thomas@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

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

The key to establishing an effective school wide plan is to have well defined expectations, ensure consistency with enforcement and possess the ability to develop and emphasize proactive strategies rather than reactive ones along a continuum of positive behavior support. John A. Crookshank Elementary is fully

committed to participating in the Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program. PBIS is a data-driven framework to promote and maximize academic success and behavioral proficiency. It is a systems approach to enhancing the capability of schools to educate all students by developing research-based, school-wide, and classroom behavior support systems. The process focuses on improving our ability to teach and support positive behavior for all students. Schools are successful when students are encouraged and allowed to grow academically, socially, and emotionally. The ultimate goal of PBIS is to create a safe and productive environment where educators can teach and all students can learn without disruption. By setting clear social and behavioral expectations and directly teaching our students how to model those expectations, we can create a positive and productive atmosphere where ALL students have an environment where they CAN succeed and grow both academically and socially.

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

Administration: Establish an opportunity for parents to interact and engage with school in ways that were not done before, Enhance use of social media with parents and create opportunities for parents to participate in parent leadership academies, Become familiar with the unique strengths of school and community, Focus on high impact activities that build relationships, Seek parent and community input on culture and climate, Attend Community and PTO meetings, Be visible daily, Engage in discussions about school brand. Support teachers in the classroom in regard to creating strong classroom communities.

Faculty & Staff: Continued and consistent communication with parents and guardians. Promote the School-Wide PBIS program and Guidelines for Success. Develop positive incentives inside their classrooms. Invite parents to become volunteers in the classroom and for special events. Be active participants in our PTO and also at our school wide events.

PTO: Develop a clear member recruitment plan. Message a business partnership recruitment plan. Create opportunities for parents and community to participate in school wide events.

We also involve all stakeholders and give them a voice in our school. We continue to share information via the School Message Alert System, our website, newsletters, parent-teacher conferences, Family Spirit Nights (through our PTO), surveys, conversations, and meetings.