

St. Johns County School District

Fruit Cove Middle 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

Fruit Cove Middle School

3180 RACE TRACK RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Jacobson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/3/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	8%
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 (70%) 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

Fruit Cove Middle School

3180 RACE TRACK RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-fcs.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)
Middle School 6-8	No	8%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	37%

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.

Fruit Cove Middle School is committed to building positive student-teacher relationships, focusing on high academic standards and developing the six pillars of character in all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fruit Cove Middle School will inspire in all students a passion for lifelong learning, creating educated and caring contributors to the world.

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
Jacobson, Kelly	Principal	
Hilts, Adrienne	Assistant Principal	
Winter, Holli	Assistant Principal	
Sisson, Lori	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/3/2017, Kelly Jacobson

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.*

21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

66

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,210

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

17

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

22

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	371	419	399	0	0	0	0	1189
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	60	70	0	0	0	0	171
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	51	51	0	0	0	0	121
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	18	17	0	0	0	0	44
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	0	0	22	48	41	0	0	0	0	111
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	22	37	40	0	0	0	0	99

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
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

Wednesday 8/3/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	387	403	435	0	0	0	0	1225
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	59	60	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	35	27	0	0	0	0	91
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	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	0	21	16	21	0	0	0	0	58
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	22	23	0	0	0	0	59

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	11	8	0	0	0	0	31
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	387	403	435	0	0	0	0	1225
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	59	60	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	35	27	0	0	0	0	91
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	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	0	21	16	21	0	0	0	0	58
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	22	23	0	0	0	0	59

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	11	8	0	0	0	0	31
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	73%	67%	50%				78%	68%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	54%						68%	59%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						54%	48%	47%
Math Achievement	83%	37%	36%				85%	77%	58%
Math Learning Gains	72%						70%	68%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						56%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	75%	75%	53%				79%	70%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	95%	65%	58%				97%	88%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	81%	74%	7%	54%	27%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	77%	72%	5%	52%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
08	2022					
	2019	76%	71%	5%	56%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	80%	74%	6%	55%	25%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	85%	80%	5%	54%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
08	2022					
	2019	78%	78%	0%	46%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	78%	72%	6%	48%	30%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	97%	90%	7%	71%	26%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	79%	21%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	98%	81%	17%	57%	41%

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	31	39	35	43	56	44	37	76	29		
ELL	56	60	50	79	63	45		88			
ASN	93	68	67	93	78	75	97	95	96		
BLK	60	50	29	64	64	38	75	100	88		
HSP	60	52	35	79	71	60	54	93	65		
MUL	65	43	24	78	71	56	87	90	69		
WHT	74	54	43	83	72	59	76	96	81		
FRL	53	46	43	63	61	48	52	89	71		
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	32	38	32	38	34	34	42	72	20		
ELL	61	65	61	70	57	64	64				
ASN	93	85	79	93	68	64	90	97	90		
BLK	74	65	53	63	59	56	64	90	62		
HSP	64	56	37	71	56	46	61	83	63		
MUL	62	61	74	71	46	56	52	95	57		
WHT	77	63	47	80	56	49	84	94	78		
FRL	58	59	47	60	52	35	61	74	50		
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	32	47	42	56	55	52	44	85	13		
ELL	36	67	69	67	63	64					
ASN	93	76	64	97	83		93	97	85		
BLK	69	84	71	65	63	45	50	88	54		
HSP	70	60	45	81	65	51	80	93	50		
MUL	61	53	69	76	58	50		94			
WHT	80	68	52	86	70	58	80	98	57		
FRL	60	62	51	69	53	50	68	86	29		

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	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	633
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	63
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	85
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	63
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	63
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	65
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	71
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	58
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?

ELA: dropped 2% in overall achievement, dropped 11% in ELA Learning Gains, dropped 8% in Lowest 25.

Math: Increased 5% in overall Math Achievement, increased 15% in Learning Gains, increased 10% in Lowest 25%

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

ELA Learning Gains

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

Students have gaps in their learning from the two prior years due to the pandemic. We must address the gaps while moving forward with current standards.

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

Math Learning Gains increased by 15 points.

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

Teachers focused on remediating students' learning gaps while also teaching the grade level standards.

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

Small group instruction
Adding rigor to instruction and assessment
Aligning our BEST Standards to the FAST assessment

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.

PD on small group instruction and remediation strategies

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

N/A

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

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

Increase the percentage of students making a learning gain on the 2023 ELA FAST PM 3. The percentage of students that made a learning gain from 2021-22 decreased from 65% to 54%.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

The percentage of students making learning gains on 2023 ELA FAST PM 3 will increase from 54% to 65%.

Monitoring:

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

FAST PM assessments and ongoing formative assessments are used for progress monitoring. Administrators/Instructional Literacy Coach actively participate in grade level ELA CLT meetings where student data and performance on formative assessments are reviewed by the CLT. Leadership team will review FAST PM data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Reading classes have been differentiated based on state test score performance. ELA and Reading teachers will use evidenced-based interventions, such as scaffolding and explicit instruction, to support student learning

Rationale for Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Scaffolding instruction (Hattie Effect Size .82) helps teachers meet the individual needs of students. Our teachers, also, use several explicit teaching strategies (Hattie .57 effect size) such as small group instruction, technology, differentiated reading programs to meet the individual needs of their students. When teachers use frequent progress monitoring and adjust instruction, they are better able to determine student needs and make instructional adjustments to promote student growth.

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.

- 1.) All ELA, reading, and core teachers will know students FSA 2023 scale scores and how to determine if students made a learning gain.
- 2.) ILC will provide professional development on Performance Matters and how to measure a learning gain.
- 3.) All ELA, reading and core teachers will monitor the progress of their students by reviewing data with their CLT on all common formative and summative assessments to identify learning gaps.
- 3.) ELA and reading teachers will use FAST PM data to analyze learning gaps and areas of weakness. ELA and reading teachers will work together to provide focused small group instruction based on student needs.
- 4.) Teachers will attend professional development to learn strategies for remediation and differentiation.
- 5.) CLT's will develop a plan for remediation to address learning gaps.

Person Responsible Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to PBIS

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:

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

Increase the number of participating teachers to 100% in the PBIS school-wide program which supports positive student behavior and Character Counts.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We can run a report that identifies teacher participation in the PBIS program informing us how many Pilot Points each teacher awards to students over a set period of time.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor the number of Pilot Points each teacher awards and will also monitor our discipline report comparing our data from last year to see the impact of our PBIS program on student behavior.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holli Winter (holli.winter@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Collective teacher efficacy: the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students

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: the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students. Collective efficacy has an effect size of $d+ 1.57$ and is strongly correlated with student 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.

- 1.) Focused positive mentorship of students struggling with behavior concerns.
- 2.) School-wide PBIS implementation with a focus on promoting a positive school climate that encourages students to grow academically, socially, and emotionally.

Person Responsible Holli Winter (holli.winter@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.

Staff will make a collective effort to support the students with disabilities to promote meaningful relationships, increase engagement in instruction, and decrease behavior issues in classes. There is a 42 point gap between the ELA achievement of SWD students and the entire student population, as well as a 40 point gap in math achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Decrease the learning gap from by 10 points in both categories

Monitoring:

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

Administration will review progress monitoring data, interim reports, report cards, and attendance data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Supporting learners with special needs using a combination of supports and interventions. Use available evidence to identify where learners are in the learning progression, identify specific evidenced-based interventions, implement those interventions with fidelity, and continually monitor the impact of those interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The effect size of supporting learners with special needs is 0.80. The effect size of differentiation is 0.46. To increase the effectiveness of this strategy it will be coupled with scaffolding learning (0.58) and creating challenging goals (0.59).

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Teacher Recruitment and Retention**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

For various reasons, 25% of our teachers left FCMS at the end of last year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percentage of teachers leaving FCMS at the end of the school year will decrease.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators will support teachers with an ongoing focus on teacher support systems, open communication, and positive feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Teachers will be given a layered support system of Collaborative Learning Teams, Department Chairs, Instructional Literacy Coach, and Math Coach. New teachers and teachers new to the district will also be given mentors/buddies, and monthly meetings to provide ongoing support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

When teachers feel supported they have a higher likelihood of not leaving the school. Our goal is to recruit and retain the best 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.

1. Monthly support meetings will be held for new teachers and teachers new to our district. While teacher leaders will be leading these meetings, administration will support the leaders and teachers with resources and refreshments.
2. Monthly meetings with Department Chairs will include professional development in high yield strategies so our teacher leaders can share their knowledge with their departments to support other teachers.
3. Ongoing professional development will be offered to teachers in identified areas of needs based on the needs of our students.
4. Feedback will be solicited from teachers to identify areas of support needed.

Person Responsible

Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@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 Positive Behavior Intervention System is a nationally recognized program that is committed to addressing student behavior through the usage of effective systems, data, and practices. Through the usage of the program, schools can experience better social and academic outcomes, a reduction in office discipline referrals, and improvement in student behavior.

As part of FCMS' implementation of the Positive Behavior Intervention System, we have established a clear Behavior Expectation Flight Plan that focuses on 3 of our 'Character Counts' pillars: Responsibility, Respect and Citizenship. For each Pillar, the Flight Plan outlines behaviors that are representative of (responsibility, respect, or citizenship) of all our stakeholders. The goal is to promote, encourage, and reward positive behaviors. The behaviors will be taught, reviewed, and highlighted with fidelity and are clearly and visually displayed throughout the school.

Some other important components to PBIS are behavior intervention plans (tracking behavior goals for individual students), collection of data for discipline referrals, and the Rewards feature that allows students to earn Pilot Points for demonstrating positive behavior expectations. Pilot Points can be used at the PBIS Store or for daily, weekly, monthly, or quarterly celebrations.

We know that supporting students, faculty and staff engage in positive behavior will build a school community where everyone feels they belong, can succeed, learn, and grow.

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

Administration: Ongoing development and support of our PBIS program and WEB program

Teachers: Implementation of our PBIS program with fidelity

Instructional Support: Support teachers in the use and implementation of the PBIS program

Support Staff: Support teachers in the use and implementation of the PBIS program

Parents: Volunteer at school events, encourage their students to participate in the PBIDS program.