Sebastian Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sebastian Middle School

2955 LEWIS SPEEDWAY, St Augustine, FL 32084

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

Demographics

Principal: K IR Stie Gabaldon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (56%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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

Sebastian Middle School

2955 LEWIS SPEEDWAY, St Augustine, FL 32084

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	44%

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	B		B	B

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sebastian Middle School's vision is to cultivate high achieving, college and career ready students who excel in a complex and changing world.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gabaldon, Kirstie	Principal	
Gamble, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Pillay, Alexandra	Assistant Principal	
Smith, Recia	Instructional Coach	
Hayes, Kevin	Dean	
Tagliarini, Darrin	School Counselor	
	Other	Frankie Portelos

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, K IR Stie Gabaldon

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.*
0

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

Total number of students enrolled at the school
653

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
17

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
14

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	205	210	253	0	0	0	0	668
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	70	80	0	0	0	0	203
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	38	34	0	0	0	0	100
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	19	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	19	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	52	50	0	0	0	0	135
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	52	50	0	0	0	0	135
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	52	50	0	0	0	0	135

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	31	58	53	0	0	0	0	142

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 9/7/2022

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	223	258	245	0	0	0	0	726
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	62	63	0	0	0	0	174
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	35	32	0	0	0	0	90
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	56	30	0	0	0	0	97
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	36	53	0	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	67	46	0	0	0	0	147

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	29	17	0	0	0	0	71
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	223	258	245	0	0	0	0	726
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	62	63	0	0	0	0	174
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	35	32	0	0	0	0	90
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	56	30	0	0	0	0	97
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	36	53	0	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	67	46	0	0	0	0	147

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	29	17	0	0	0	0	71
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	58%	67%	50%				55%	68%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	48%						52%	59%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%						41%	48%	47%
Math Achievement	60%	37%	36%				61%	77%	58%
Math Learning Gains	56%						61%	68%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						54%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	67%	75%	53%				65%	70%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	65%	58%				76%	88%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	60%	74%	-14%	54%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	57%	72%	-15%	52%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
08	2022					
	2019	55%	71%	-16%	56%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	59%	74%	-15%	55%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	55%	80%	-25%	54%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
08	2022					
	2019	53%	78%	-25%	46%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	63%	72%	-9%	48%	15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	87%	13%	67%	33%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	80%	90%	-10%	71%	9%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	99%	79%	20%	61%	38%
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	17	30	28	23	33	34	31	41	18		
ELL	29	42		33	44						
BLK	33	35	23	24	35	27	38	71	20		
HSP	56	49	32	60	55	35	64	70	69		
MUL	50	44		50	40		67				
WHT	63	51	37	67	60	48	73	74	70		
FRL	39	36	27	39	46	40	40	55	50		
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	23	31	28	21	33	30	24	46			
ELL	33	33		57	42						
ASN	70			80							
BLK	25	32	30	22	22	22	13	57			
HSP	52	52	21	63	52	31	45	77			
MUL	45	33		56	29						
WHT	64	55	35	62	48	42	74	79	74		
FRL	37	37	29	38	35	32	41	51	41		
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	19	39	39	25	52	49	22	52			
ASN	80			90							
BLK	23	43	47	27	51	49	28	48			
HSP	50	47	20	51	56	42	60	79	56		
MUL	61	41		72	65						
WHT	59	54	43	65	63	59	68	81	66		
FRL	38	46	46	47	54	52	50	62	35		

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	500
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
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	50
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	60
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	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ELA proficency has been steadily increasing. Learning gains in ELA have dropped overall and have dropped in the lowest 25%. Math achievement increased by 3pts overall, and math learning gains have increased by 11 pts. The lowest 25% in math have increased by 7pts. Overall science achievement continues to increase to 67% proficient. Civics achievement dropped by 4pts to 72%. Percentage of students taking acceleration course dropped by 5pts to 66%. For the 4th year in a row the school grade is a B, with an increase of 2pts to a 56%.

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

Greatest need for improvement is with our students with disabilities. We are in our 4th year of lower learning gains with our SWD compared to non SWD. In addition, African-American students and ELLs have also depicted lower learning gains for 4 years.

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

Number 1 - Staffing. 7th grade had vacancies in English, Science, and Math more than once during the 2021-22 school year. Lack of consistency in instructional strategies and monitoring due to staffing shortages.
Number 2 - Teacher and student absences due to Covid. (See Early Warning Indicators)

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

Math showed the most improvement in learning gains going from 45-66%. The lowest quartile increased going from 35-42%.

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

Mentoring of new teachers contributed to this improvement. Progress monitoring using iXL in math classes. PLC model.

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

Weekly PLC team meetings to create common formatives and summatives as well as to analyze data. Based on data analysis, teams will plan for tier 2 instruction with a focus on small group instruction and more frequent monitoring using formative data. Monthly professional development for teachers with a focus on effective instructional strategies. Implementing a math tutoring program which will serve subgroups; minorities and SWD.

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.

Monthly professional development for teachers with a focus on effective instructional strategies. Monthly new teacher meetings to support and guide teachers new to the district and school. School administration team providing feedback to teachers through classroom observations.

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

Continue to provide relevant and effective training with support using the PLC model. Ongoing progress monitoring using standards-based formatives and summatives. Utilizing coaches and district specialist to support teachers and 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.	Students with disabilities have not shown required growth based on state testing in ELA and Math for the last 4 years.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	We want to increase ELA learning gains from 39% to 45% for SWD. We want to increase Math learning gains from 51% to 56% for SWD.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	FAST PM1, PM2, and Final State Assessments .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alexandra Pillay (alexandra.pillay@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teacher uses formative assessment to facilitate tracking of student progress of learning targets/standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	To identify student needs and provide differentiated instruction using a variety of methods; such as grouping, project based learning, remediation and enrichment.

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 SWDs and their current level of achievement based on state tests.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Schedule students in appropriate course based on IEP and assign a case manager.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Professional development for teachers of ESE students using the PLC model.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will monitor progress using formative and summative assessments.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Collaboration between core teacher and ESE teacher for small group instruction - planning and delivery

Person Responsible	Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Communication about student progress between parents and PLCs.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	African-American students have not shown sufficient learning gains for 4 years.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	African-American students will increase ELA learning gains from 35% - 41%. African-American students will increase Math learning gains from 35%- 41%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	FAST PM1, PM2, and Final State Assessments .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alexandra Pillay (alexandra.pillay@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teacher uses formative assessment to facilitate tracking of student progress of learning targets/standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	To identify student needs and provide differentiated instruction using a variety of methods; such as grouping, engagement strategies, project based learning, remediation and enrichment.

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 African-American students and their current level of achievement based on state tests.

Person Responsible	Alexandra Pillay (alexandra.pillay@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Schedule students based on district and state criteria.

Person Responsible	Kirstie Gabaldon (kirstie.gabaldon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Professional development for teachers using the PLC model that is culturally relevant.

Person Responsible	Recia Smith (recia.smith@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will monitor progress using formative and summative assessments.

Person Responsible	Kirstie Gabaldon (kirstie.gabaldon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Collaboration between core teacher and ESE teacher for students with an IEP.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Communication about student progress between parents and PLCs.

Person Responsible	Darrin Tagliarini (darrin.tagliarini@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Leaders of Tomorrow - a leadership opportunity given to African-American males lead by school counselor, Mr. Tagliarini.

Person Responsible	Darrin Tagliarini (darrin.tagliarini@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	ELL students have not shown suffiecient learning gains in the last 2 years.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	ELL students will increase ELA learning gains by 5 points from 42% to 47% ELL students will increase Math learning gains by 5 points from 44% to 49%. ELL students will increase their Reading Level on ACCESS 2 by one level.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	FAST PM1, PM2, ACCESS2 and Final State Assessments .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alexandra Pillay (alexandra.pillay@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teacher uses formative assessment to facilitate tracking of student progress of learning targets/standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	To identify student needs and provide differentiated instruction using a variety of methods; such as grouping, engagement strategies, project based learning, remediation and enrichment.

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.

Teacher training on instructional strategies, accommodations and modifications with ELL students on PD Wednesdays by district personnel and school leadership.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring of student grades and social/emotional needs through MTSS Team.

Person Responsible	Leanne Fortune (leanne.fortune@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

ELL service providers push in to Gen Ed classrooms for small group instruction, once a week.

Person Responsible	Darrin Tagliarini (darrin.tagliarini@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Teachers plan for and utilize ESOL strategies to be used for ELL students.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for 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.	

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

School uses Single School Culture script. All teachers review the same script with students about the culture and expectations of the school. The purpose of SSC is for students to have consistency, structure and feel safe. In addition to SSC, Sebastian Middle School implements PBIS Rewards to encourage students to show respect, own their actions, accept differences, and realize potential (SOAR). This program encourages students to make good choices regarding their behavior and rewards them for doing so. Students can earn points and use them for a variety of activities around the school including, festivals, outside lunches, and to buy things in the PBIS stores around campus.

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

All faculty, staff, students, and parents are made aware of SSC and PBIS through newsletter, school website, and announcements.