

St. Johns County School District

Durbin 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 |

Durbin Creek Elementary School

4100 RACE TRACK RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

Demographics

Principal: Ashley McCormick

Start Date for this Principal: 5/10/2021

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: A (73%) 2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (73%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * 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 |

Durbin Creek Elementary School

4100 RACE TRACK RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-dce.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 | 48% |

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 mission of Durbin Creek Elementary is to make positive contributions to society by expanding minds to explore our expanding world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Durbin Creek Elementary School will promote a positive educational environment conducive to learning. We will promote respect, caring and a sense of community. Durbin Creek Elementary will develop an atmosphere where students develop a strong desire to learn, excel, and develop excellent character.

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Echevarria, Tatiana | Assistant Principal | LEA, PLC, testing coordinator |
| Slater, Melissa | Instructional Coach | Professional Development, MTSS. Literacy Leadership |
| McDonald, Rachel | School Counselor | Student Services, intervention, direct instruction in SEL, Character Counts |
| Rodgers, Jennifer | School Counselor | Student Services, intervention, Direct instruction in SEL and Character Counts |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 5/10/2021, Ashley McCormick

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.*

4

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

Total number of students enrolled at the school

950

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

8

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

15

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 | 124 | 144 | 161 | 143 | 148 | 177 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 897 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 7 | 12 | 15 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | |
| 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 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | |
| 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 | 130 | 134 | 120 | 138 | 163 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 823 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 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 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 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 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

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 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| 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 | 130 | 134 | 120 | 138 | 163 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 823 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 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 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 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 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

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 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| 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 | 81% | 74% | 56% | | | | 84% | 75% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 66% | | | | | | 71% | 67% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 55% | | | | | | 60% | 59% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 85% | 50% | 50% | | | | 87% | 77% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 77% | | | | | | 71% | 69% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 68% | | | | | | 60% | 59% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 77% | 77% | 59% | | | | 69% | 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 | 88% | 78% | 10% | 58% | 30% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 89% | 77% | 12% | 58% | 31% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -88% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 74% | 76% | -2% | 56% | 18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -89% | | | | |

| 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 | 90% | 82% | 8% | 62% | 28% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 85% | 82% | 3% | 64% | 21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -90% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 80% | 80% | 0% | 60% | 20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -85% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 70% | 73% | -3% | 53% | 17% |
| 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 | 40 | 45 | 42 | 55 | 64 | 61 | 24 | | | | |
| ELL | 61 | 47 | | 71 | 80 | | 50 | | | | |
| ASN | 96 | 85 | | 97 | 85 | | 83 | | | | |
| BLK | 71 | | | 71 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 67 | 44 | 44 | 71 | 55 | 56 | 53 | | | | |
| MUL | 86 | 42 | | 86 | 89 | | 70 | | | | |
| WHT | 81 | 69 | 54 | 86 | 78 | 68 | 81 | | | | |
| FRL | 65 | 51 | 44 | 65 | 61 | 50 | 43 | | | | |
| 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 | 47 | 42 | 38 | 53 | 65 | 64 | 39 | | | | |
| ELL | 64 | | | 73 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 94 | 70 | | 96 | 75 | | 81 | | | | |
| BLK | 67 | | | 58 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 71 | 64 | | 81 | 86 | | 69 | | | | |
| MUL | 74 | | | 93 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 81 | 69 | 53 | 87 | 71 | 75 | 85 | | | | |
| FRL | 69 | 69 | | 71 | 56 | | 53 | | | | |
| 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 | 58 | 65 | 56 | 64 | 70 | 69 | 42 | | | | |
| ASN | 91 | 75 | | 96 | 88 | | 82 | | | | |
| HSP | 68 | 58 | 38 | 80 | 70 | 67 | 47 | | | | |
| MUL | 79 | | | 79 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 87 | 75 | 66 | 88 | 69 | 56 | 73 | | | | |
| FRL | 69 | 63 | 41 | 70 | 66 | 58 | 45 | | | | |

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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 71 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 59 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 568 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 47 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 61 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 89 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 71 |
| 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 | 56 |
| 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 | 75 |
| 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 | 74 |
| 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?

Trends across third through fifth grade consistently show ELA and Math achievement levels above both the district and state levels. Durbin continues to show higher achievement levels in math than in ELA. This is a historical trend and presents a consistent pattern. When we dig deeper and analyze our subgroup data for FSA, we continue to see a disparity between students with disabilities and general education students. This subgroup is not making learning gains comparable to other subgroups. This past year the ELA achievement for this subgroup was 40%. This is down seven percentage points from the prior year. When looking at the three year data, we see a downward trend each year which is significant enough to analyze.

The impact in ELA is greater than in Math with math achievement levels showing higher (70%).

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

The data component with the need for the most improvement would be the learning gains in ELA and the learning gains of our lowest 25%. We see a stagnant state for overall achievement with a decline for our students with disabilities. The learning gains for our ELL population also show low learning gains at 47%.

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

Previously, we saw significant gaps in foundational skills as a result of virtual learning and inconsistency in instruction. Last year we began to build the consistency with a focus on phonics and interventions. The true impact will take some time to see. Even last year, we did not begin the year with the flexibility for grade levels sharing students and planning focused, targeted intervention. This started to happen

later in the year. We are working towards increasing the amount of small group instruction throughout the day now as we are open to sharing students and relying on the expertise of multiple teachers. Actions for the year include focus on the PLC process and strengthening small group instruction.

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

The greatest improvement is seen with learning gains for math. A 6% increase was seen in 2021-2022.

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

We had not seen a shift in the state math standards last year. The school had an increase in teachers participating in math professional development as well. The high yield strategies learned in the professional development was starting to be seen in classrooms across grade levels.

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

The focus will be to deepen our knowledge and use of effective literacy instruction. A focus on small group instruction must continue. Through weekly one hour long PLC meetings we will work with grade levels on using common assessments and analyzing data to monitor the effectiveness of our instruction. As we analyze, we must continue to identify barriers for students and work towards removing them. We have seen significant learning occur when we use our data to drive instruction , we must ensure and guarantee this among all grade levels.

Together as a leadership team, we will plan professional development on intervention and high yield strategies.

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.

The leadership team is planning for continued PD for Foundations for K-2. We see significant gaps in phonics so we want to be sure to deepen teacher learning in this area. We will couple this with continued focus on formative assessments and using them to drive our instruction. This will be paired with PD on engagement and high yield strategies for all.

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

The focus we are planning for will build the blocks and bridge us into improving through the years. If we align carefully and provide continued , meaningful experiences and PD that build upon one another we should be on our way . We will look carefully at Performance matters as a tool to assist us in our PLCs.

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 have seen a decrease in the ELA achievement levels over the last three years for student with disabilities (58%,47%,40%). A pattern is emerging and it is important to identify the contributing factors. We must dissect our instructional practices and equip teachers with effective tools which yield high results.

Measurable Outcome:

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

See an increase in ELA achievement through the Common Summative Assessment data. We will take baseline data and set a goal from there.

Monitoring:

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

The MTSS Core team will collaborate to monitor this subgroup more often with an identified tool. The team will work in collaboration with the ILC and Achievement coach. We will focus on evidence based interventions and the monitoring of their effectiveness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Slater (melissa.slater@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Evidence based intervention.

We will work towards professional development for teachers in this area. This will be paired with strategies for monitoring the effectiveness of each intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

It has been observed teachers don't always feel confident with what next steps to take with our most struggling learners. We must provide professional development and monitor the fidelity and consistency of research based interventions. The MTSS team will research guiding tools for problem solving to assist in strengthening our own team so we can better support teachers.

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.

Professional development in intervention.

Person Responsible

Melissa Slater (melissa.slater@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Monitor fidelity of interventions through observation and PLC.

Person Responsible

Melissa Slater (melissa.slater@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Share data quarterly (SWD) with MTSS Core team , monitor , analyze and problem solve.

Person Responsible

Melissa Slater (melissa.slater@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. 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 observation, an absence of small group instruction has been identified. Small group instruction must be infused throughout the day. With the prior goal of increasing professional development on interventions, small group instruction is key. We will work with teachers on how to incorporate small group instruction while using research based interventions with fidelity.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the number of teachers utilizing effective small group instruction by 10%. This can be tracked through observations and coaching cycles.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through the observation schedule and PLC teams. We will gather baseline data at the beginning of the year and compare with end of the year data. Student progress monitoring data will be used to measure the effectiveness of instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley McCormick (ashley.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

A focus will be placed on sequential and systematic instruction. Instruction must follow a logical sequence and progress from simple to more complex. Professional development will focus on this progression while maintaining the importance of concept review throughout.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Our lowest quartile learning gains for students with disabilities show disparity in data compared to general education population. We are finding that this subgroup benefits from targeted small group opportunities. If we can be more prescriptive and sequential we will see an positive impact on 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.

Professional development on intervention/small group sequential instruction. Collaboration between ILC and Achievement Coach.

Person Responsible

Melissa Slater (melissa.slater@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Monitor through observation cycle. Debrief with leadership team after each cycle.

Person Responsible

Ashley McCormick (ashley.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Monitor assessment data with PLC team on each grade level.

Person Responsible

Ashley McCormick (ashley.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment 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.

It is critical to improve our feedback practices through the observation process. It is easy to get busy and overwhelmed with the number of observations required and the feedback piece may be cut short. In order to impact instruction we must have timely, meaningful feedback practices in place.

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

As a result of feedback practices, we will see an improvement score in specified areas for individual teachers. This will be monitored through the observation tool. Leadership team will debrief, set goals and monitor.

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

Leadership team will set goal for feedback and monitor teacher efficacy and improvement through the district observation tool. We will monitor evaluation scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley McCormick (ashley.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

We will undergo research on effective feedback practices and implement new strategies. A timeline will be set for the amount of time between an observation and when and how feedback is given.

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

In order to impact instruction we are increasing professional development to maintain discussion and feedback for continuous improvement (aligned with the professional development). We can strengthen by improving our feedback practices. The leadership team will research feedback practices and create an action plan.

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.

Research effective feedback practices.

Person Responsible Ashley McCormick (ashley.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Create an action plan for the observation cycle and how it connects to feedback on instruction practice.

Person Responsible Ashley McCormick (ashley.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Monitor results through observation, monitor scores in domains where feedback has been given.

Person Responsible Ashley McCormick (ashley.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

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

We continue to see students display behaviors not seen in the past. Discipline referrals show an area of focus in identifying emotions, communicating needs and emotions appropriately and problem solving. Student demographics continue to change. Our ELL population continues to grow, some coming to us with no English acquisition. In addition, we still see a loss of some foundational social skills. A decrease in positive peer interactions is evident as a result.

Measurable

Outcome:

State the specific measurable

outcome the school plans to achieve.

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Decrease student discipline referrals by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

Leadership team in collaboration with MTSS Core team will monitor discipline data and RTI behavior plans. The number of Mental health referrals will also be monitored.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tatiana Echevarria (tatiana.echevarria@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Increase school counselor time in the classrooms using a research based curriculum focused on SEL. School counselors will participate in student time during PLC and will schedule monthly with their targeted grade levels.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

We must build SEL capacity within our student body while still implementing character counts along the way. A research based curriculum helps establish a common language that can be used as students transition to new grade levels each year. It will build from year to year.

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.

Purchase research based curriculum.

Person Responsible Ashley McCormick (ashley.mccormick@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Create consistent schedule for counselors to deliver lessons and build relationships with students.

Person Responsible Rachel McDonald (rachel.mcdonald@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Create system of support for teachers in addressing the social emotional needs of their students.

Person Responsible Jennifer Rodgers (jennifer.rodgers@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.

Durbin Creek is committed to building a positive school culture. The leadership team strives to model this for staff daily. Twenty teachers participated in a "Capturing Kids Hearts" training this summer which is building a bridge towards building positive relationships with student and one another. We start with relationships and allow ourselves the time to foster relationships before jumping into instruction. Classrooms have developed social contracts where the classroom community makes commitments to how they will work together. The staff also has developed a social contract for the year. We will commit to ongoing training in this area.

Durbin creek will maintain a positive school culture with respect and dignity for all and one where we celebrate our students! A school wide positive behavior system exists. The system is communicated with families so they can partner with us in keeping students and families engaged. Communication will also be consistent with SAC and PTO members.

Our leadership team is committed to service and we work to build trust and maintain a high level of support or all stakeholders. We accomplish through open doors, visibility, working right alongside our staff. We commit to keeping both students and staff engaged and having fun.

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

Stakeholders include teachers, students, families of students, volunteers and school board members. Communication with all happens through team leader gatherings, weekly leadership meetings, SAC and PTO meetings. Discussion in all areas is focused on the vision and the goals of the school. Stakeholders are involved and their input is valuable. Our PTO does an incredible job of promoting school goals and functions in a positive way through social media. They assist the school in keeping the families informed. School administration attends PTO sponsored Spirit nights at various businesses as well.