
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

Julington Creek Elementary School

2316 RACE TRACK RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

Demographics

Principal: Joy Reichenberg

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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)	18%
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 (79%) 2017-18: A (76%)
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

Julington Creek Elementary School

2316 RACE TRACK RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">18%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">28%</p>

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.

At JCE, we will provide quality instruction in core academics as well as additional opportunities for enrichment related to the arts, technology and overall wellness. We will emphasize character education and recognize children who demonstrate qualities of good character both at school and in the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

JCE...where children grow to be well-rounded people of character, innovative and college/career ready.

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
Murphy, Jeanette	Principal	School Principal
Ciliberti, Ashley	Assistant Principal	
Johnston, Dana	Teacher, K-12	
Morrison, Donna	Instructional Coach	
Foster, Valerie	SAC Member	
Milite, Ruth	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Joy Reichenberg

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,057

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

9

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

23

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	110	114	150	152	189	166	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	881
Attendance below 90 percent	7	2	8	2	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	4	3	1	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	5	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	14	5	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	1	0	3	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	4	2	0	0	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

Monday 7/18/2022

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	101	137	148	173	158	180	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	897
Attendance below 90 percent	4	5	4	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	2	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	3	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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	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	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	2	1	10	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	101	137	148	173	158	180	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	897
Attendance below 90 percent	4	5	4	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	2	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	3	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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	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	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	2	1	10	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	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%				86%	75%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	71%						77%	67%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	69%						78%	59%	53%
Math Achievement	85%	50%	50%				89%	77%	63%
Math Learning Gains	67%						78%	69%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%						63%	59%	51%
Science Achievement	76%	77%	59%				80%	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	83%	78%	5%	58%	25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	85%	77%	8%	58%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	87%	76%	11%	56%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

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	87%	82%	5%	62%	25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	85%	82%	3%	64%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
05	2022					
	2019	90%	80%	10%	60%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	79%	73%	6%	53%	26%
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	53	55	61	62	40	42	38				
ELL	65	43		65	57						
ASN	83	86		83	75		77				
BLK	68	69		68	69	60					
HSP	74	80	73	79	73	73	67				
MUL	72	70		72	40						
WHT	84	68	69	88	66	65	79				
FRL	79	72	72	82	63	56	69				

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	59	57	54	71	39	47	41				
ELL	71			76							
ASN	91			94			92				
BLK	46			46							
HSP	75	68		85	64	55	65				
MUL	79			93							
WHT	86	68	57	91	61	58	78				
FRL	73	39		73	28		67				
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	65	59	54	78	66	61	41				
ELL	64			82	70						
ASN	88	94		96	88						
BLK	78	88		67	53		77				
HSP	75	70	65	82	72	65	65				
MUL	69			92							
WHT	89	77	82	91	80	65	82				
FRL	69	65	55	75	58	48	67				

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	77
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	100
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	613
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
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	66
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	81
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	67
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	74
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	64
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	70
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?

SWD had the lowest proficiency and learning gains.

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

Greatest need for improvement is science proficiency within the SWD subgroup.

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

Greater focus on ELA & Math learning gains through PLC and interventions. New actions include PLC science planning with a focus on reading comprehension strategies.

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

Bottom 25 quartile increased 9 percent in ELA learning gains.
 Bottom 25 quartile increased 8 percent in math learning gains.

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

Continue with consistent reading intervention provided by a certified reading teacher/interventionist in addition to regular instruction. This occurs during the school day.
 Continue with math small group reteaching on essential standards.

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

Fidelity with phonics instruction K-2. Interventions using research based instructional materials.

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 & fidelity checks for the phonics program during preplanning and throughout the school year. Professional development and fidelity checks on intervention curriculum.

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

Lexia interventions will begin in October after teacher training in September.

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. SWD subgroup had the lowest proficiency scores in Science. There was also a decrease from last year.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. In Science, SWD proficiency will increase to 50% from 38%.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Monitored through science formative assessments, reteaching essential standards, and state progress monitoring tool three times a year (reading comprehension). Fidelity checks will take place by admin and ESE achievement coach for further professional development.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Strategies being implemented are small group reteaching and reading comprehension strategies to tackle science texts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. Reading data reflects increase in SWD reading learning gains. Therefore using strategies used last year for reading comprehension such as small group reteach and a focus on reading strategies on science text will increase science comprehension and knowledge.

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 reading comprehension using science texts will be provided by our Literacy Coach.

Person Responsible Donna Hillenbrand (donna.hillenbrand@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Modeling small group instructional practices provided by our ESE Achievement Coach.

Person Responsible Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Monitor growth through formative assessments.

Person Responsible Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. 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.

This school year we hired 23 new teachers.

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

Our goal is to retain 90% of our teachers.

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

Monitored through interviews, professional development needs and teacher growth plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Strategies used are offering consistent professional development based on specific needs, instructional modeling, observations with feedback, and mentoring program.

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

Through observations, data is collected for specific professional development needs so we may support our teachers' 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.

Observations with feedback throughout the year.

Person Responsible

Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Mentoring program focussing on district and school based activities (ie grading, discipline, conferences, etc..).

Person Responsible

Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Differentiated and ongoing professional development and instructional strategy modeling.

Person Responsible

Donna Hillenbrand (donna.hillenbrand@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. 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.

ELA proficiency has dropped the last three years from 86 to 84 and now 81.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA proficiency scores will increase by 3 points, from 81 to 84.

Monitoring:

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

Monitored through state progress monitoring three times a year, DRA , and essential standards assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Strategies being implemented are phonics reading interventions and consistent small group reteach on essential reading comprehension strategies by classroom teacher and interventionist.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Data reflects that classroom instruction is not enough to close the gap. Additional consistent small group instruction and intervention in the areas of phonics and reading comprehension will be provided by certified interventionist.

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.

Teachers were trained this summer on using district wide phonics program and ELA curriculum. Follow up to the training will be provided throughout the school year.

Person Responsible

Donna Hillenbrand (donna.hillenbrand@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Monitor DRA, progress monitoring data, and formative assessments.

Person Responsible

Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Instructional literacy coach will train certified interventionist on evidence based strategies.

Person Responsible

Donna Hillenbrand (donna.hillenbrand@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

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

Social emotional learning in conjunction with character counts was identified based on current student needs.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

Students will show an increase in displaying appropriate character traits using strategies to identify mood/behaviors and independently implement a strategy to defuse or change the behavior or mood.

Monitoring:

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

ABC data, suspension data and behavior incident data will be reviewed every 6 weeks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

K-2 teachers will use Conscious Discipline daily to help students identify mood and use breathing techniques to de-escalate the behavior or anxiety. Guidance counselors, resource teachers, and all classroom teachers will incorporate morning meetings, character building lessons and strategies for students to learn and identify their mood and behaviors as well as take an active role in choosing the appropriate strategy to change the behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students need additional exposure to these strategies and lessons throughout the day within different environments so they become a routine in their lives.

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.

K-2 teachers took part in Conscious Discipline training during preplanning. A school team has developed and will work with the district team on implementation and further professional development.

Person Responsible Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Guidance team will pull appropriate character counts lessons each month and make them available to each of the grade levels. They will also carry out social emotional lessons in each classroom.

Person Responsible Jeanette Murphy (jeanette.murphy@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 school continues to build a positive school culture and environment through ongoing professional development, recognition, proactive communication with families, support for families and staff in need, providing volunteer opportunities to our families, and continuing to pull resources to assist with every need that comes our way including social emotional needs.

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

Stakeholders impact our positive school culture. They are actively involved in the following ways: PTO/SAC meetings and community events involving business partners, Family Bingo, Staff Appreciation Week, Curriculum Nights, and ongoing staff and student recognition activities throughout the school year.