

St. Johns County School District

Patriot Oaks Academy



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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Patriot Oaks Academy

475 LONGLEAF PINE PKWY, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

Demographics

Principal: Drew Chiodo

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-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 (76%) 2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (77%)
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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Patriot Oaks Academy

475 LONGLEAF PINE PKWY, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-poa.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)
Combination School KG-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	36%

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.

Committed to every student every day!

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Patriot Oaks, we are a community that fosters character development, independence and a lifelong love of learning.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Carlson-Bright, Dianna	Assistant Principal	
Zamparelli, Alexis	Assistant Principal	
Adkins, Lynn	Assistant Principal	
Wetjen, Chris	Dean	
Wimmer, Christopher	Other	
jensen, kylea	Teacher, K-12	
Olson, Bonnie	Teacher, K-12	
Olson, Allison	Principal	
Susice, Kim	Instructional Coach	
Luettich, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Drew Chiodo

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.*

8

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.*

22

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

84

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,467

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

1

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

16

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	95	95	129	148	154	163	149	164	148	0	0	0	0	1245
Attendance below 90 percent	9	8	4	1	4	7	13	16	26	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	1	0	10	3	6	3	6	13	22	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	1	11	1	9	9	8	3	3	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	3	3	0	0	0	0	22
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	3	0	6	0	0	7	5	8	0	0	0	29

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	
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/12/2022

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	92	121	137	150	159	139	167	148	176	0	0	0	0	1289
Attendance below 90 percent	5	4	9	3	4	4	7	6	14	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	12	5	6	8	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	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	1	2	8	2	6	0	0	0	0	19
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	3	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	2	1	1	1	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year		2	3	3	5	5	6	4	3	5	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times		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	92	121	137	150	159	139	167	148	176	0	0	0	0	1289
Attendance below 90 percent	5	4	9	3	4	4	7	6	14	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	12	5	6	8	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	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	1	2	8	2	6	0	0	0	0	19
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	3	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	2	1	1	1	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	3	5	5	6	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	36	
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	80%	75%	55%				85%	84%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	69%						70%	67%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						63%	61%	54%
Math Achievement	85%	45%	42%				89%	88%	62%
Math Learning Gains	77%						74%	71%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%						68%	66%	52%
Science Achievement	71%	81%	54%				77%	77%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	98%	71%	59%				93%	95%	78%

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	87%	78%	9%	58%	29%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	81%	77%	4%	58%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
05	2022					
	2019	86%	76%	10%	56%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
06	2022					
	2019	84%	74%	10%	54%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
07	2022					
	2019	85%	72%	13%	52%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
08	2022					
	2019	84%	71%	13%	56%	28%
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	82%	82%	0%	62%	20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	85%	82%	3%	64%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	93%	80%	13%	60%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
06	2022					
	2019	84%	74%	10%	55%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-93%				
07	2022					
	2019	92%	80%	12%	54%	38%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
08	2022					
	2019	83%	78%	5%	46%	37%
Cohort Comparison		-92%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	79%	73%	6%	53%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	74%	72%	2%	48%	26%
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	93%	90%	3%	71%	22%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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	100%	81%	19%	57%	43%

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	52	58	52	60	61	52	31	89	44		
ELL	42			58							
ASN	91	87		92	86	77	80	100	94		
BLK	71	72	50	67	75	70					
HSP	76	54	54	82	70	67	60	93	86		
MUL	77	81		81	78	55	64				
WHT	80	67	58	85	76	68	73	100	76		
FRL	69	69	68	75	78	74	67	100	82		
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	48	46	36	61	62	52	50	76			
ELL	58			83							
ASN	93	91		90	79		89	100	100		
BLK	67	62	50	72	81	75	64				
HSP	74	65	41	79	60	50	68	92	94		
MUL	79	68		94	73		64				
WHT	79	70	55	87	73	65	79	97	82		
FRL	64	50		76	57		70				
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	55	60	51	59	56	55	47	71	17		
ELL	55			45							
ASN	96	75		97	82	70	96	100	83		

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
BLK	61	53	36	70	61	57	58				
HSP	86	74	64	85	77	56	76	90	57		
MUL	81	76		87	86						
WHT	85	69	64	90	73	70	76	93	62		
FRL	79	74		73	78		90				

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	76
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	686
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
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	50
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	88
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	68
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	71
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	73
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	76
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	76
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?

Regarding our students with disabilities, our achievement, learning gains and learning gains for the lowest 25% in ELA made strong gains. While we celebrate this and recognize the many efforts that went into these gains, our achievement and learning gains in math stayed consistent for this same subgroup. When reviewing the data from our black students, we also see a similar trend. The achievement and learning gains went up, specifically the learning gains, while math stayed consistent or dropped. Overall, the learning gains for our lowest 25% made a 5 point gain in ELA and 3 point gain in math. Our overall learning gains in math were up 5 points overall but this gain was not seen in the two subgroups mentioned above.

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

Our students with disabilities are not making the same learning gains as our general education population in math based on this data. While our data is consistent overall and our students are strong learners, we continue to have disparity between the achievement and gains for our students in subgroups versus our white students. The only variance here is that our Asian students outperform all subgroups consistently.

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

The subgroup data show that our students with disabilities made gains but not at the same rate. While we focused on this group in our elementary school with specific tutoring and did see gains, we need to consider continuing the efforts and moving them into the middle school.

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

The gains for our lowest quartile students in both reading and math were up, 5 points and 3 points reading and math respectively. This is a celebration as we made significant efforts with these students in building relationships with Project Connect and in targeting these students for each of our tutoring opportunities. We are thrilled to see how these efforts helped students grow.

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

Project Connect with our MS Elective team and ES resource team to build relationships
 Tutoring with the use of SAC funds, after school grades 3-8
 Tutoring with the use of a district grant, after school grades K-5
 Tutoring with the use of our own funds, during school grades K-5

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

We focus a lot on our lowest quartile students with remediation. This is important but we also need to focus on accelerating, pre-teaching and expanding the learning opportunities for our students. We need to look for more real life connections and projects to help students to connect and apply their learning.

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.

We are doing a study this year as an instructional staff on Project Based Learning in order to give our students more opportunity to apply and show their learning in more authentic ways. I meet every 6-7 weeks with each team and we discuss our reading, make plans to implement and report back.

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

We hope that the funds used last year for tutoring are available again. We are beginning to actively look for tutors and resources that will continue to grow our students.

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.

Our students with disabilities are not achieving and gaining at the rate of their non-disabled peers. While we have made gains here in both reading and math, the disparity continues. We need to continue the efforts.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal is to see a 3 point gain in learning gains in reading and a 3 percentage point gain in overall achievement in reading for these students. Our focus will be on reading.

Monitoring:

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

Students receive specific instruction through their IEPs and their growth is monitored. We will offer tutoring for them using Lexia Core 5 as a resource so we can monitor progress. We will also use BAS, QRI and our phonics assessments to monitor progress. These will be given quarterly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dianna Carlson-Bright (dianna.carlson-bright@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Wilson Foundations with Lexia Core 5 will be used for our elementary students. They will do 2 days small group instruction with a teacher and two days using the individualized computer program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

This strategy was used last year with growth seen for students. We have trained teachers who believe in the program.

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.

Determine the group of students to invite and inform parents.

Person Responsible

Dianna Carlson-Bright (dianna.carlson-bright@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Invite and secure teachers to provide the instruction.

Person Responsible

Alexis Zamparelli (alexis.zamparelli@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Organize days, times and locations as well as progress monitoring.

Person Responsible

Dianna Carlson-Bright (dianna.carlson-bright@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#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 two years of COVID, teachers were unable to implement group engaging instructional strategies. Last year we did professional development on how to engage students using the book, Teach Like a Pirate. Teachers experimented and regained their enthusiasm for engaging lessons. The growth in creativity in our classrooms was outstanding. We need to continue as we have many new staff. The new staff will do this book study along with the school-wide professional study of Project Based Learning to further our efforts to engage and grow students.

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

Based on this professional development and focus, our goal is to see a 2 point gain in overall achievement in math and reading.

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

Student data from the FAST and STAR assessments will be monitored for growth as well as classroom observations will be done to give feedback on student engagement and how to improve.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Book study with assignments, discussion and implementation timelines.

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

Our professional development plan follows these steps each year and it is strong. We see gains in teacher efficacy and skill as we observe in classrooms. With a single focus school-wide, we discuss often and problem solve together on how to implement together. It is a collaborative effort.

selecting this strategy.

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.

Follow through with written professional development plan written over the summer with the ILC.

Person Responsible Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Monitor implementation through discussion, evidence produced and observations in classrooms.

Person Responsible Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

We are working to be stronger with our PLC teams. This year we will split our leadership team into two groups- leadership team that problem solves logistics and a guiding coalition that drives the PLC process within our teams. We feel this split of responsibilities will build capacity in teachers and put more focus on growing our collaborative teams.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We hope to have more data analysis in our teams. We have assigned a member of our admin team to each grade level or department and will have an active role on each PLC team as they grow together.

Monitoring:

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

Growth and focus of PLCs will be monitored through active participation during the team meetings by our admin team and guiding coalition members.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Evidence is strong that collaborative teams achieve more than teachers working and planning alone.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

This is the next logical step in our growth as a school is to put more focus on our collaborative teams.

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.

Determine team and monthly dates to meet.

Person Responsible

Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Using the team, determine agenda items and areas to focus and learn about.

Person Responsible

Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Lowest Quartile Students

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

We continue to need to build a culture of caring adults for our students in our lowest quartile. We have seen gains made here with our students based on teacher efforts through Project Connect and will continue this again this year.

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

We want to see a 3 point rise in learning gains for our lowest 25% in both reading and math based on increased relationships with adults.

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

The elective and resource teams will meet monthly to discuss their assigned students and the interactions they have had to build relationships.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Evidence is clear that meaningful relationships help students to engage more with their school and their learning. When students feel they are noticed, heard and cared for, they are more likely to learn and grow.

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

We have done Project Connect for 3 years and have seen consistent gains for our lowest 25%. Our teachers are encouraged by the growth we can see and believe in their power to make a difference.

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.

Make a list of the lowest quartile student and create a ppt to be shown to elective and resource teachers. Make assignments of students to teachers.

Person Responsible

Kim Susice (kimberly.susice@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Meet monthly with the teams to learn about their interactions with students.

Person Responsible

Allison Olson (allison.olson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Monitor growth data on each child through the year as well as end of year data.

Person Responsible

Kim Susice (kimberly.susice@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.

We employ Good Chargers as part of our Character Counts program and recognize students for doing the right things and exemplifying the pillars of character. Students are recognized with tickets, weekly drawings and monthly awards. Pictures are taken and posted on bulletin boards.

As part of our weekly emails to staff, we take time to thank groups of staff for helping and going above and beyond. We consciously express gratitude for the hard work of staff.

We do snacks for teachers two times per month to let them know of our appreciation for their hard work. Our PTO provides one and our admin team provides the other.

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

Our PTO actively supports our teachers with monthly snacks, significant events for Staff Appreciation Week, Teacher Supply closet, teacher appropriations, gifts for teachers on their birthdays, notes of appreciation from our community for each staff member and more. They are outstanding in supporting our staff.

Our SAC team offer ideas and approve money to tutor students.

Our business partners offer spirit days where our community can visit and build relationships.

Our parents actively participate in PTO events, school sporting events and volunteer opportunities to show their support and appreciation for the work of school staff.