Ketterlinus Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ketterlinus Elementary School

67 ORANGE ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

http://www-kes.stjohns.k12.fl.us/

Demographics

Principal: Kathy Tucker

Start Date for this Principal: 6/30/2010

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)	47%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (64%) 2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (62%)
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

Ketterlinus Elementary School

67 ORANGE ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

http://www-kes.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	47%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

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.

KES will accomplish the highest academic achievement possible for each of our students within a safe learning environment that is staffed by caring, highly qualified teachers and staff.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that "all children can learn and succeed" but not on the same day in the same way.
We believe that increased student achievement, along with school safety, should be our top priorities.
We support the six pillars of character as outlined in the Character Counts! Program.
We strive to build a true professional learning community.
We understand the critical connection between home and school.
While supporting high standards and the need for a core academic curriculum, we also believe in the theory there are multiple intelligences in human beings.

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
Tucker, Kathy	Principal	
Sclafani, Lisa	Assistant Principal	
Allen, Pamela	Other	
Brush, Sue	Instructional Coach	
Killin, Larissa	Teacher, K-12	
McCutcheon, Sandy	School Counselor	
Hilbert, Bethany	Math Coach	
Golz, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Literacy leadership team
Tagliarini, Shari	Teacher, K-12	Literacy Leadership Team
Lavery, Michael	Teacher, K-12	Literacy Leadership Team
Wood, Jane	Teacher, K-12	Literacy Leadership Team
Cumpton, Erin	Teacher, K-12	Literacy Leadership Team
Smith, Jaime	Behavior Specialist	MTSS Core Team/ Literacy Leadership

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/30/2010, Kathy Tucker

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

2

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

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Total number of students enrolled at the school

400

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

3

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

4

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 8/1/2022

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	71	73	55	59	92	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	409
Attendance below 90 percent	10	11	2	2	15	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	5	4	5	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	3	8	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	3	13	7	10	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
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	71	73	55	59	92	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	409
Attendance below 90 percent	10	11	2	2	15	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	5	4	5	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	3	8	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	3	13	7	10	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
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	70%	74%	56%				73%	75%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						70%	67%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						67%	59%	53%
Math Achievement	77%	50%	50%				76%	77%	63%
Math Learning Gains	67%						69%	69%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%						48%	59%	51%
Science Achievement	64%	77%	59%				63%	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	68%	78%	-10%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	76%	77%	-1%	58%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2022					
	2019	69%	76%	-7%	56%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

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	74%	82%	-8%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	78%	82%	-4%	64%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2022					
	2019	72%	80%	-8%	60%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	60%	73%	-13%	53%	7%
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	33	48	39	49	58	50	36				
BLK	57			62							
HSP	94	75		94	73						
WHT	69	57	46	76	65	54	64				
FRL	51	49	43	58	63	57	47				

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	46	59		44	35		21				
BLK	45			15							
HSP	82			88							
WHT	77	64		80	69		62				
FRL	51	54		55	42	10	32				

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	31	50	57	45	47	35	44				
BLK	56	70		53	64						
WHT	75	70	70	79	68	54	66				
FRL	63	66	65	69	65	41	50				

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	64
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	447
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	60
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	84
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
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?

Students with disabilities made lower achievement in ELA, Math and Science (Gr. 5 only) and lower learning gains in ELA and Math. In addition, compared to 2019, students with disabilities in the lowest quartile in ELA made lower gains in 2022. Students with disabilities also had lower achievement in science compared to 2019.

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

The data components are based on FSA in which our state has eliminated. However, the data showed the need to improve with students with disabilities the in all areas measured.

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

Ketterlinus has a significant number of ESE students in self contained program for behavior as well as in general education. All students (& families) were impacted by the pandemic, but our students that were already significantly below level and families became very overwhelmed in being able to assist.

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

Math - math learning gains overall, math learning gains with the lowest quartile and students with disabilities in math.

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

The school was able to reimplement Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and share students. The focus in grades 3-5 was in math. We saw a similar upward trend when we implemented PLC model prior to the pandemic.

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

Continue to follow the PLC model in which teachers identify the essential standards and share students. In addition, the use of frequent progress monitoring to help identify those areas that need acceleration and students.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development opportunities include continuous training on the new B.E.S.T Standards and resources. Also, training on interpreting the new data provided through FAST progress monitoring, and provide training to K-3 teachers on the Science of Reading.

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

Building capacity with key staff members to become lead teachers. We have identified two teachers to help fill those roles through the use of ESSER funds. One is focusing on ELA and ESE services & accommodations, and the other is focusing on Math and ESE services.

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.**	Continue our focus on ESE students in both math and ELA. Although we have shown gains in math, we have slipped a little in ELA achievement and Lowest Quartile Learning Gains with students with disabilities. The school has hired two additional staff members that are ESE certified to assist in ELA and Math. They will assist in providing services but focus on identifying areas of need and resources. This year, we have implemented blocks of schedules that are non-negiotable for all classrooms including our self-contained ESE programs. The blocks include required small groups, intervention groups and whole group time in which additional services cannot interrupt.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Both achievement and learning gains will increase. ELA learning gains will increase to 50%, and math learning gains will increase to 60%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	FAST testing classroom observations through district's EEE program District and school CSQ's (Common Summative Questions)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Targeted instruction in small groups Goal setting for independent reading practices Feedback from formative assessments (CSQ's)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Students with disabilities would benefit from small group instruction and frequent monitoring.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	With higher student engagement, students will achieve higher academic achievements. Based our data with our subgroups - students with disabilities which includes many of our students from poverty and are African American, our school wants to engage students more during the school day. The school finds it difficult to engage students afterschool, so we need to maximize our school day.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	We will continue to utilize our quarterly DRA, district's summative quizzes, state's FAST progress monitoring in ELA for all students that are underperforming in ELA/Reading. For math, our school will utilize both STAR Math, district summative quizzes and the state's FAST progress monitoring.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Our MTSS/RTI and Literacy Leadership Team will review results and make recommendations. Administration will utilize district's EEE observation and state's literacy walk-throughs to ensure fidelity of high yield strategies are being implemented.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The majority of instructional staff had participated in a book study of "Poor Student, Rich Teaching" in 21-22 school year. This year, the Literacy Team and MTSS team will identify 4 high yield strategies that were identified in the book to be implemented.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The strategies that are selected are research-based in achieving at least a year's 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.

Identify the (4) highest yield strategies

Person Responsible	Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Teach/train instructional staff during the 1st quarter on at least 1 strategy

Person Responsible	Sue Brush (suzanne.brush@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Administrative staff will conduct observation on the fidelity of the implementation and provide feedback to instructional staff and leadership team.

Person Responsible	Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. 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.	It is our belief that all staff wants to improve and achieve higher student achievement. However, it is important (and difficult) to maintain a focus on implementing high yield strategies. Like students, our teachers require targeted instruction/professional development and feedback in order to implement high yield strategies and gain higher student achievement.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Both achievement and learning gains will increase. ELA learning gains will increase to 50%, and math learning gains will increase to 60%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	FAST testing classroom observations through district's EEE program District and school CSQ's (Common Summative Questions)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Weekly walk-throughs during ELA. Feedback provided during on specific high-yield strategies through district's EEE observation model.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	t is our belief that all staff wants to improve and achieve higher student achievement. However, it is important (and difficult) to maintain a focus on implementing high yield strategies. Like students, our teachers require targeted instruction/professional development and feedback in order to implement high yield strategies and gain higher 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.

Administrative staff will conduct observation on the fidelity of the implementation and provide feedback to instructional staff and leadership team.

Person Responsible   Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention System ({PBIS)	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	All students would benefit from social and emotional learning. The pandemic created a time of isolation for many families.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Discipline referrals and crisis/counseling referrals will decrease .
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Classroom observations of lessons and procedures. MTSS Core Team will review early warning signs (attendance, discipline, suspensions, MTSS/ESE referrals) for Tier 1 PBIS and Conscious Discipline implementation
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	PBIS and Conscious Discipline strategies as Tier 1 components.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Students will benefit from social emotional learning to reduce absence, discipline and engage academic engagement.

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.

School has hired a behavior interventionist to assist school in coaching teachers and staff on positive behavior strategies. She will maintain a focus on specific subgroups (Students with Disabilities)

Person Responsible	Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

School has hired a behavior interventionist to assist school in coaching teachers and staff on positive behavior strategies. She will maintain a focus on specific subgroups (Students with Disabilities)

Person Responsible	Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@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.

Ketterlinus implements the Conscious Discipline program as part of the Positive Behavior Intervention System. Each staff member ties procedures and rules to our school-wide SWIM - Safe, Well-Mannered, Inspiring & Improving and Makes Good Decisions.

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

All staff members utilize our common language based on SWIM. All classroom teachers implement the following strategies within their classrooms - morning greets, morning meetings, wish you well board, family board, and classroom jobs. All staff members focus on the positive behavior by providing recognition in the form of our school-wide Dandy Dolphin programs. Resource teachers and cafeteria staff provide Perfect Pods for positive class-wide behavior. Teachers collect the Perfect Pods and when the class reaches their goal of 20 (k-2) or 25 (3-5) the class earns a reward.
The classroom teachers also teach and focus on the pillars of character through our district-wide Character Counts! program. Each month a student is selected from the class as the representative for that month's character pillar. Each week, teachers select a Dolphin of the Week or Student of the Week. Administration provides recognition in the classroom with an award certificate.