

St. Johns County School District

Cunningham Creek 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cunningham Creek Elementary School

1205 ROBERTS RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

Demographics

Principal: Katie O'connell

Start Date for this Principal: 10/6/2020

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	14%
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: A (65%) 2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (65%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cunningham Creek Elementary School

1205 ROBERTS RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-ccs.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	No	14%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	27%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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 Caring Cardinals of Cunningham Creek will build strong bodies, hearts, minds, and spirits so we can live, love, learn, and lead.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cunningham Creek Elementary School is a community of Caring Cardinals, committed to creating an atmosphere that encourages students to develop to their greatest potential. Through our commitment to Communicating, Caring and achieving Excellence, all Cardinals will soar with a passion for lifelong learning.

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
OConnell, Katherine	Principal	Lead the school in determining areas of focus Provide resources and remove obstacles Support the faculty and staff Partner with the families and community Encourage and motivate students Lead CORE team Serve on MTSS problem solving team
Yeoman, Lydia	Assistant Principal	Co-lead school initiatives Focus and support the ESE programs Provide school wide guidance and support to all stakeholders Serve on MTSS team
Barnes, David	Assistant Principal	Co-lead school initiatives Provide school wide guidance and support to all stakeholders Facilitate transportation and safety programs Serve on MTSS team
Ritchie, Christa	Instructional Coach	Serve on MTSS team Provide training, coaching and support to all instructional staff Facilitate mentoring program Guide and direct curricular decisions and instructional frameworks

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 10/6/2020, Katie O'connell

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.*

2

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

49

Total number of students enrolled at the school

683

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

14

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

16

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	90	83	101	76	104	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	9	3	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	1	0	7	2	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	4	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	17	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	0	0	3	6	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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

Tuesday 9/6/2022

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	85	100	84	124	92	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	574	
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	2	4	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	
One or more suspensions	3	2	0	4	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
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	4	6	25	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	1	1	1	4	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	4	2	7	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	
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	85	100	84	124	92	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	574
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	2	4	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	3	2	0	4	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	4	6	25	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	1	1	1	4	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	4	2	7	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	75%	74%	56%				80%	75%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	67%						74%	67%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						68%	59%	53%
Math Achievement	79%	50%	50%				87%	77%	63%
Math Learning Gains	63%						77%	69%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						71%	59%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	77%	59%				75%	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	84%	78%	6%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	87%	77%	10%	58%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2022					
	2019	77%	76%	1%	56%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				

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	92%	82%	10%	62%	30%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	87%	82%	5%	64%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-92%				
05	2022					
	2019	91%	80%	11%	60%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	77%	73%	4%	53%	24%
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	38	40	27	47	46	41	31				
BLK	36			64							
HSP	71	81		82	56						
WHT	79	69	44	81	64	46	77				
FRL	48	56	38	50	39	23					
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	40	27		46	47		33				
ASN	55			82							
HSP	70			87							
WHT	74	61	38	79	56	62	65				
FRL	45	30		44	50		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	46	64	59	51	59	50	47				
ASN	92			83							
HSP	76	86		80	85						
WHT	79	73	72	88	78	76	74				
FRL	75	75		79	71						

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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	452
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39

Students With Disabilities	
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
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	73
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	66
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	42
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?

Our 3rd grade ELA performance was significantly higher than previous year. There was a significant decrease in math performance in our 5th grade cohort last year. There was a continued decline in performance for our lowest quartile in learning gains for math and reading, although we did see a positive increase in overall learning gains for ELA. Our SWD subgroup fell below 41% for the second year and will be a focus for school improvement.

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

Learning gains for our lowest quartile and SWD subgroup in math and ELA.

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

Inconsistent progress monitoring and assessment for students in self-contained behavior classes. Disruptive behaviors impacted ability to assess and intervene. A renewed focus on academics and grouping to ensure accountability will address our need for improvement.

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

ELA achievement went up 2% points
 ELA learning gains improved by 8% points
 Math learning gains improved by 5%
 Science performance increased by 17% points

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

We implemented the new BEST ELA standards with fidelity, held student data chats, required the use of learning strategies, hired teachers with experience in teaching Science and created and supported intervention groups using assessment data.

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

Implementation of BEST Math standards and standards based curriculum, use of district CSA data, PLC teams forming nest groups based on assessed standards and support of part time tutor running small group instruction.

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 will be focused on BEST Math implementation, continued fidelity of BEST ELA, Foundations, Wilson, SIPP groups, and the continued use of data for decision making, grouping, instruction and intervention.

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

The addition of an ESE Achievement Coach and a part time certified tutor, specifically focusing on K-3, will provide support necessary to ensure student success. Their support for teachers, instruction, interventions, fidelity checks will greatly impact our lowest quartile and SWD subgroup.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. 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.

With the growth we have experienced in enrollment and staffing we are focusing on consistent and timely feedback. We need to ensure compliance and fidelity in curriculum and materials and support the observable element that focuses on student practice and processes for learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teachers will be observed performing at applying or innovating in standard implementation and evidence of student practice 90% of the time. Teachers will be observed using implemented curriculum 100% of the time.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly walkthroughs for literacy, math and evidence of student practice. Data compiled from walkthroughs will be discussed in CORE team meetings every Tuesday.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katherine OConnell (katherine.oconnell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Collective Teacher Efficacy -PLC- unpacking standards, using authentic assessments, implementing BEST standards and ensuring student practice, solutions and modeling. Teachers share outcomes and focus on student achievement in PLC team meetings twice a month.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

All of our work and focus is supported and enriched through our PLC process and our CORE team. Data driven decisions lead to positive teacher and student outcomes.

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.

Created a spreadsheet for "look fors" to be completed weekly by admin and ILC to ensure fidelity of curriculum implementation.

Person Responsible

Katherine OConnell (katherine.oconnell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Literacy Team will conduct weekly walkthroughs and discuss data

Person Responsible

Katherine OConnell (katherine.oconnell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

BEST Math walkthrough form created and shared with admin to observe implementation of standards and modeling and solving practices.

Person Responsible

David Barnes (david.barnes@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards**Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

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

We are committing to growth in Math grades 3-5 and to each student reaching their potential and meeting their individual growth goals.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will see a 3% increase in math performance in grades 3-5 with the implementation and support of BEST math standards and the fidelity of the curriculum and common assessments.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through grade level PLC data analysis, district common assessment results, report cards, interims, common formatives and FAST Progress Monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katherine OConnell (katherine.oconnell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Collective Teacher Efficacy -PLC- unpacking standards, using authentic assessments, creating flexible groups based on specific deficits or enrichment needs
RTI- MTSS Process
NEST & WIN Groups
Differentiated instruction within class and among grade level

Rationale for Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Collective Teacher Efficacy has the highest yield effect on student performance. This collective partnership is implemented through our PLC process which uses data based decision making to drive instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Review individual student data

Person Responsible

Christa Ritchie (christa.ritchie@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Use data to build NEST groups (nurturing every student's talents)

Person Responsible

Christa Ritchie (christa.ritchie@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Implement strategic and specific instruction in skills and strategies

Person Responsible

David Barnes (david.barnes@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Monitor and assess for progress and need for remediation

Person Responsible

David Barnes (david.barnes@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. 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.

SWD will perform above 41% on assessments for math and ELA. We are committed to our SWD subgroup reaching their potential and demonstrating their capabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students will improve performance by 3% in ELA and math

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through grade level PLC data analysis, district common assessment results, report cards, interims, common formatives and FAST Progress Monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lydia Yeoman (lydia.yeoman@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Collective Teacher Efficacy -PLC- unpacking standards, using authentic assessments, creating flexible groups based on specific deficits or enrichment needs
RTI- MTSS Process
NEST & WIN Groups
Differentiated instruction within class and among grade level
Support of ESE Achievement Coach

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Collective Teacher Efficacy has the highest yield effect on student performance. This collective partnership is implemented through our PLC process which uses data based decision making to drive instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Review individual student data and create an inclusive master schedule to include support facilitation

Person Responsible

Lydia Yeoman (lydia.yeoman@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Quarterly progress reports and progress monitoring

Analyzing growth trends quarterly to adjust instruction and intervention as needed

Person Responsible

Lydia Yeoman (lydia.yeoman@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Student and Staff Recognition

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

Through our continued focus on decreasing discipline, celebrating positivity, SEL support and district support of Conscious Discipline we have identified a common theme of positivity and have become a certified Energy Bus School.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase in student recognition, positive interactions, decrease in suspensions and improved parent participation in positive celebrations.

Monitoring:

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

We will track the number of students and staff recognized for their positivity
 We will survey parents and community members to ascertain impact on community
 We will see a decrease in referrals

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katherine OConnell (katherine.oconnell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Evidence demonstrates the positive effect of SEL on academic and behavioral outcomes
 Active monitoring of student behavior and recognition of student success will allow us to identify trends early and impact behaviors and outcome

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

By implementing a culture of positivity we are developing students who have greater capacity for individual growth and achievement

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.

Monthly recognition of students and staff members

Person Responsible

Katherine OConnell (katherine.oconnell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Expectation assemblies for grades 3-5 at the start of the year and again at the start of second semester. Setting the tone for behavior expectations and the power of positivity.

Person Responsible

Katherine OConnell (katherine.oconnell@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.

This year, Cunningham Creek Elementary is embarking on an exciting journey! We are the first Certified Energy Bus School in St. Johns County. The Energy Bus is a book by best-selling author and speaker, Jon Gordon (<https://jongordon.com/>). In his book, Gordon outlines ten rules for life focused on positivity and teamwork. These rules have been adapted for a children's audience in "The Energy Bus for Kids". We will teach and model the "5 Rules for the Ride of My Life" for our students and host fun activities surrounding this initiative. What are the five rules?

1. Create a positive vision
2. Fuel your ride with positive energy
3. No bullies allowed
4. Love your passengers
5. Enjoy the ride

Each month, students will participate in an exciting Energy Week. During our Energy Weeks, we will recognize staff and students, participate in energy activities, and have a Spirit Day. Our staff and student recognitions include designating C.E.O.s (Chief Energy Officers) from each classroom who will be positivity champions with their peers. We want kids excited for a positive year, full of energy and school spirit!

Part of this initiative is to invite our students, parents, community members, and business partners onto our CCE Energy Bus.

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

Principal, classroom teachers and team leads will recognize monthly Chief Energy Officers - CEOs and include them in a welcoming display at our main entrance.

Morning messages are read and focus on the 5 rules and positive energy.

Assistant Principal David Barnes conducts SEL lessons and activities with staff to support our RIDE on the Energy Bus during each WOW Wednesday.

Christa Ritchie, ILC, recognizes and supports student work on school bulletin board displays that support the 5 rules and concepts of the Energy Bus.

Every employee has a "fuel tank" and we are all fueling each other's rides with positive notes and cards.

Every month there is an Energy Week when our stakeholders all support the school vision and parents and PTO participate in spirit days and special treats for staff and students.

SAC and business partners are supporting our vision by providing feedback and opportunities to celebrate our staff.