

St. Johns County School District

James A. Webster Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

James A. Webster Elementary School

420 N ORANGE ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

<http://webster.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Bethany Groves

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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: C (48%) 2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: C (47%)
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	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

James A. Webster Elementary School

420 N ORANGE ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

<http://webster.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	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		D	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At The Webster School we believe that all people can and will learn. To achieve our mission we will empower and inspire students with the tools necessary for increased student achievement and lifelong success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Webster Elementary School works in partnership with families and the community to develop knowledge, social-emotional skills, and ethical, compassionate character through enriched learning activities and creative expression through the arts. Together, all partners strive to remove barriers to learning so all students can experience success in a thriving community where the school serves as its center with positive and supportive links to the wider community.

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
Groves, Bethany	Principal	Oversees instructional and operational systems at School. Supports all aspects of learning for students and professional development for teachers
Coates, Danielle	Assistant Principal	shares LEA responsibilities, supports ESE and K - 2 students primarily
Mead, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Shares as LEA, supports math and grades 3 - 5 and PBIS
Hall, Rob	Instructional Coach	Supports teachers in PD, literacy, instructional learning, modeling, coaching cycles, MTSS, and testing

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/1/2017, Bethany Groves

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.*

15

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

504

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

15

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

15

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	81	56	70	71	65	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	438
Attendance below 90 percent	16	2	15	12	12	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	4	5	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	9	8	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	9	8	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	9	14	9	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	3	3	7	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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

Tuesday 9/6/2022

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	49	72	71	74	86	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	412
Attendance below 90 percent	5	10	13	20	23	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	0	5	4	10	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	13	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	2	27	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	7	20	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	10	10	14	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
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	49	72	71	74	86	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	412
Attendance below 90 percent	5	10	13	20	23	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	0	5	4	10	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	13	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	2	27	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	7	20	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	10	10	14	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
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	44%	74%	56%				41%	75%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	50%						44%	67%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						39%	59%	53%
Math Achievement	52%	50%	50%				49%	77%	63%
Math Learning Gains	55%						40%	69%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						21%	59%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	77%	59%				43%	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	46%	78%	-32%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	35%	77%	-42%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	76%	-42%	56%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

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	57%	82%	-25%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	47%	82%	-35%	64%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	80%	-46%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	37%	73%	-36%	53%	-16%
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	25	38	33	36	48	59	31				
BLK	32	51	43	41	48	38	42				
HSP	44	58		56	75						
MUL	31			69							
WHT	53	48	32	57	55	58	42				
FRL	40	50	39	49	56	53	39				
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	31	59	80	46	59	69	17				
BLK	32	38		43	62		9				
HSP	45			55							
MUL	36			55							
WHT	50	59		58	64		37				
FRL	41	57	70	50	58		22				
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	17	38	44	30	29	17	33				
BLK	29	35	29	36	35	22	16				
HSP	40			40							
WHT	46	50	47	53	43	21	58				
FRL	34	37	35	47	38	19	39				

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	334
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	42
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	58
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	49
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	47
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?

Reading continues to lag a bit behind math, although reading data is moving forward as a whole. Four of our five subgroups have also made strong progress and are off the ESSA monitor list. The only subgroup left is our students with disabilities. This subgroup has grown from 18% to 30% to 39%. They are trending in the right direction but still need to make more intensive growth as a whole.

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

Reading and science continue to be the lowest academic components. Also, our Students with Disabilities continue to perform as our lowest subgroup.

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

In general, our students start school without a large amount of literacy exposure. It creates large gaps that need to be closed. The lack of vocabulary, language exposure and background knowledge contribute as well to early reading struggles. Additionally, a lot of students moving in are coming from areas that had schools closed longer from the pandemic. Their gaps are still large and required a great deal of remediation. In science, vocabulary and background knowledge also have a significant impact on the overall exposure to science content and students' ability to process and connect new content.

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

Science scores on the FSA improved from 28% to 42%.

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

Our 5th grade teachers instituted a common Science system around FCIMS that used common directed lessons that were taught daily and assessed weekly. These lessons and this system ensured students received critical content on each standard. The assessments also allowed the team to remediate the students that did not master a particular standard. The result was a 14% increase in science proficiency than the previous FSA score.

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

Tightening the intervention blocks at each grade level for reading and math is a priority, specially with several new staff members who are new to this process. Using vocabulary and schema to preload context for students should also help increase fluency and comprehension. Continuing the intervention block for math around the new standards will continue. Additionally, our 5th grade teachers will continue to FCIMS System for Science as we did last year. This process will also expand down to 4th grade as well.

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.

Our teachers will receive training in student engagement, the new state testing system, fluency and vocabulary strategies as well as Foundations and SIPPS phonics intervention systems as needed. We also will spend PD time in the new math standards and strengthening our common commitments and implementation of Conscious Discipline and PBIS.

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

We will continue to use Title 1 funds to hire interventionists in reading that can support more students gaining the phonics skills needed to access grade level material by third grade and thus reducing the number of students that need intensive remediation in upper grades. Grade level PLCs and Coaching will also be used to increase the skills and capacity of teachers and the planning, assessment, and intervention systems that support their Tier 1 instruction.

Areas of Focus

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

:

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

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

Current FSA 21-22 data indicates that less than 50% of students in grades 3-5 have reached grade level proficiency. While grade level data indicates the phonics interventions used are moving more students to grade level reading expectations, the overall independent reading proficiency of students in grades 3 and higher continues to lag at 44% proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

On the 2022 - 2023 FAST testing, ELA proficiency will score at least 50% proficient. Overall learning gains will be at least 55%, and our Bottom Quartile will score learning gains at least 50%.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring ELA progress will occur the following ways throughout the year:
 BAS reading levels 3x a year - grades K - 5
 Dibels Fluency levels - at least 3x a year - grades K - 5th
 SIPPS & Foundations Phonics program - fluidly as students progress through their levels = grades K - 5th
 District Common Focus Quizzes and Grade level Formatives and Summatives - as occurring in the course of the current map and units of study
 FAST State Assessment - STAR Early Literacy, literacy & Cambria - 3x a year - K - 5th

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bethany Groves (bethany.groves@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Students will receive engaging Tier 1 instruction based on standards with formative and summative assessments embedded into the instructional cycle and Tier 2/3 small group instruction targeted at intensive instruction on areas of need as indicated by progress monitoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Core instruction must be engaging and grounded in BEST standards as well as best literacy practices in order for students to become fluent in literacy. Adequate growth is extremely difficult to achieve unless Tier 1 instruction is focused, engaging, and monitored. In addition, efficient Tier 2/3 interventions must be targeted to supplement learning gaps and clarify unmastered grade level material.

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.

Hire 2 Reading Interventionists and 2 paras to support Tier 2 and 3 interventions

Person Responsible

Bethany Groves (bethany.groves@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Teachers, administrators, interventionists and ESE teachers will meet in PLCs to examine standards, students' progress monitoring data, and make adjustments to Tier 1 and Intervention groups based on data.

Person Responsible Rob Hall (rob.hall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will receive regular feedback through walkthroughs based on standards, strategies, and instructional practices used in Tier 1, 2, and 3. This data will be used by administration and the Literacy Leadership Team to determine coaching needs for teachers and Professional Development needs for the school.

Person Responsible Bethany Groves (bethany.groves@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

A Tier 2 ELA block will be embedded into the Master Schedule and used to provide small group interventions at least 2 days a week to all students whose data indicates the need.

Person Responsible Bethany Groves (bethany.groves@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

The School based Literacy Team will meet monthly to examine literacy needs of the school, plan events for students and families that promote literacy, and examine the school-wide data to suggest adjustments in literacy practices and professional development targeted at both improving the instruction and achievement in literacy.

Person Responsible Rob Hall (rob.hall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

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

School wide data indicates that small group intervention, especially around the SIPPS reading intervention and in grades 4 and 5 math, helped students make greater progress than those without this intervention. Therefore the monitoring and expansion of small group instruction is critical to the process of closing the gaps for all students.

Measurable Outcome:**State the specific**

measurable outcome the school plans to achieve.

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Using the data and monitoring systems already present, small group instruction will be monitored and supported in order to ensure student growth beyond a year's growth for each student requiring Tier 2 or 3 instruction.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be

monitored for the desired outcome.

Walk-throughs will specifically look for the engagement level of students and the effectiveness of instruction. Data of small groups will be analyzed to determine the effectiveness of the intervention and/or the effectiveness of the teacher with a particular group or intervention. ELA progress monitoring data listed under the ELA goal will also be used.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bethany Groves (bethany.groves@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Small group instruction, along with regular teacher feedback, have strong correlations to higher achievement levels for students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

As small group instruction is increased in frequency and efficiency, students should be making greater gains to close achievement gaps.

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.

Regular walk-throughs will be conducted using the Literacy Walk-through form provided by the district. Additionally, the school will look for elements of engagement and empowerment with students around small group instruction. Feedback will be provided to teachers for reflection, coaching, and growth.

Person Responsible

Bethany Groves (bethany.groves@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Small group data will be regularly examined in grade level PLCs and in school leadership meetings. The needs of teachers and students will be addressed by coaching, change of interventions or intensity of support depending on the progress of the data and needs.

Person Responsible

Rob Hall (rob.hall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Teacher Recruitment and Retention

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

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

Our school district and school have experienced a large amount of turnover with teachers in the last few years. In order to lessen the turnover rate and lighten the load on teachers, an emphasis has been placed, by our district, on mentoring and supporting new teachers to the profession and our district in order to reduce the amount of turnover among our teachers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teacher retention for the 2023 - 2024 school year will be 80% or higher.

Monitoring:

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

Feedback will be sought from teachers during New Teacher Cadre monthly meetings, PLCs, staff meetings, and individual conferences about their needs and level of support. Administration will follow-up on providing the support needed in order to increase their confidence and connection to their colleagues.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bethany Groves (bethany.groves@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Teacher Effectiveness and Continuity continue to be two strong factors in overall school improvement. Supporting teachers so they feel competent and a higher level of connectedness and self-efficacy are more likely to result in higher student achievement scores. By providing a very directed New Teacher Cadre along with regular support for all teachers, we intend to reduce the turnover among our staff.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

When teachers are built up and are retained in their building, grade level teams are stronger, as well as teacher capacity increase due to an increase in skill and teacher efficacy.

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.

Webster staff will hold monthly trainings designed to meet the needs of new teachers to the profession and to the district.

Person Responsible

Danielle Coates (danielle.coates@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Regular feedback will be sought from teachers during PLCs, individual conferences, and at trainings in order to make sure needs are met to the best of our abilities.

Person Responsible	Bethany Groves (bethany.groves@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
---------------------------	---

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to PBIS and Conscious Discipline

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

Over the last four years, we have focused on improving positive behavior that supports good character and learning. We also have tried to reduce the number of in school and out of school suspensions also. We instituted Florida's PBIS system and have been working to increase consistency and fidelity among its application across the school. Since instituting PBIS, our behavioral data has been trending in a positive direction.

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

This year, through the implementation of PBIS and Conscious Discipline, in and out of school suspensions will be reduced from 21 - 22 numbers.

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

During Core MTSS, we will examine behavior incidents and data to discuss both students indicating struggle and also to look at any specific areas of the building where misbehavior is frequent. MTSS Core team will make recommendations and place additional supports as needed and available.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Mead (jessica.mead@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Florida's PBIS system is designed to reward, encourage and reinforce good behavior and character choices among students. When its consistency is built among all areas of a school, it has shown to demonstrate a positive impact of improving student behavior. Conscious Discipline is also a program that focuses on helping the adults in school maintain a healthy emotional skill set and then respond to students with understanding and appropriate emotional supports. This program has also been recommend by CASEL in the area of SEL education to support schools seeking to educate children with trauma-informed care.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Florida's Positive Behavior intervention System and Conscious Discipline are strategies recommended by the state of Florida and our school district. We also have seen positive results from the previous implementation of these programs and would like to increase and intensify our success with these programs.

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.

Our entire staff will receive training in pre-planning and monthly on PBIS, our school-wide implementation of PBIS and Conscious Discipline. This training will include major elements of the programs, an examination of school-wide data and problem solving as well as consistency in school-wide expectations.

Person Responsible Jessica Mead (jessica.mead@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#5. 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.

Over the last four years, our students with disabilities have not made progress of over 41%. While the progress has been moving in the right direction with the past three years being 18%, 30% and 39%, this subgroup still requires more support and problem solving in order to get their overall achievement over the 41% monitoring mark by the federal government.

Measurable Outcome:

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

On the 2022 - 2023 F.A.S.T. test our Students with Disabilities will score at or over 41% on the overall achievement mark.

Monitoring:

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

Students in this subgroup will be monitored like our other students in reading and math which includes: BAS, Dibels, Foundations, SIPPS, F.A.S.T., district and classroom formatives and summatives. Students in this category will also be monitored through interventions given because of their IEP goals and/or demonstrated instructional need like Passport Voyager, Wilson, or Lexia Core 5.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bethany Groves (bethany.groves@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Intensive small group instruction is a high yield strategy used to support the intensive needs of this subgroup. Additionally the process of differentiated interventions that are heavily monitored have also demonstrated success with students in this area. All interventions used are approved through the district's clearinghouse of highly effective interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The strategies chosen to use and monitor are all from the school district's approved list and have a demonstrated history of success for students with disabilities.

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.

Students will be assigned a small group for instruction according to their needs. Within that small group, a research based intervention will be used and regularly monitored for success and progress. Adjustments will be made to the intervention based on the data indicating student progress or the lack thereof.

Person Responsible

Danielle Coates (danielle.coates@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Data for students with disabilities will be reviewed with the classroom and ESE VE teachers, as well as the teachers of self-contained classrooms. These data reviews will occur at least once a quarter in order to look at trends, students, and adjustments that need to be made. At mid-year, after the mid-year state

round of progress monitoring the entire leadership team will review the data with the same lens of adjustments that need to be made in order for these students to become proficient and successful.

Person Responsible Rob Hall (rob.hall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Professional development will be delivered with the lens of ESE students, learning needs, and accommodations for all classroom teachers and ESE teachers. This PD will be determined by the training our ESE Coach receives from the district as well as needs indicated through administration's observations of classrooms and a review of student data.

Person Responsible Rob Hall (rob.hall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

According to the end of year I-Ready test, Kindergarten had moved from 23% to 85% green indicating early on grade level or higher. Phonics and Phonemic Awareness are still the lowest.

For grade 1, students moved from 13% to 76% green, again indicating phonics and vocabulary still the two lowest areas.

For grade 2, students moved from 22% to 61% green, indicating early on grade level. Again, phonics and vocabulary were the lower areas.

Based on this data, we are continuing to increase phonics instruction in both Tier 1 and Tier 2. We also will be introducing a whole school vocabulary emphasis.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

For 3rd grade, on I-ready students went from 36% to 71% green. Vocabulary and comprehension were the lowest. Also on FSA, 3rd grade was 52% proficient. The 3rd grade reading scores have been trending in a solid direction forward with the last four years being 39%, 46%, 46%, and now 52% proficient.

For 4th grade, I-Ready scores indicated these students moved from 36% to 48% green. The lowest

areas were vocabulary and comprehension. On FSA, the 4th grade scored 48% proficient. The last four years have seen the 4th grade grow from 35%, 35%, 26%, and now 48%.

Finally, our 5th grade on I-Ready grew from 20% to 28% proficient. The vocabulary and comprehension levels of these students were extremely low. For FSA last year, these students were only 36% proficient. The last four years of 5th grade scores were 39%, 34%, 53%, and 36%. Despite the drop in fifth grade scores, this particular cohort group went from 26% to 36% from 4th to 5th grade.

When looking at overall trends, a few insights emerge. First, the phonics instruction in Tier 1 for k, 1, and 2 (Foundations) is starting to work. However, it is not enough. The Tier 2 phonics program for all students who do not test out of it is helping as well, but again, has not been instituted long enough yet. This program is SIPPS. We are going to continue laying a strong foundation of phonics. However, once students have mastered phonics at their level, these skills have to be applied with fluency to encourage comprehension. Also, every grade level is low in vocabulary so we will begin a school wide focus on vocabulary.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

By the end of the 2022 - 2023 school year, at least 75% of K - 2 students will perform on the STAR Early Literacy test at a green (grade level proficient level) or higher.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By the end of the 2022 - 2023 school year, at least 50% of 3rd - 5th grade students will perform at the green grade level proficiency level or higher.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Every grade level has a grade level data sheet where all data is collected and reviewed by grade level PLCs with administration, by the Literacy Committee, and by our District support staff as they interact with administration. Students, classes, and grade levels are tracked for progress and proficiency with teachers and administrators. During these meetings adjustments are made to individual students, groups, classes, and grade level as needed. Adjustments can include changes in interventions, curriculum, groups, and pacing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hall, Rob, rob.hall@stjohns.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Evidenced based programs include the use of all district approved Tier 1, 2, and 3 materials. These materials include My View Savvas, Foundations, Wilson, SIPPS, and Lexia Core 5. All of these programs are also delineated in the district Comprehensive Reading Plan and align with the B.E.S.T. ELA standards. Additionally the instructional practices for this year's focus include continuing emphasis on engaged Tier 1 instruction with differentiated centers, increased instruction and monitoring around fluency, and emphasis on vocabulary strategies that build schema and background knowledge. Again, each of these are evidence-based and aligned with the district Reading Plan and the state standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The listed resources directly address the need for Tier 1 comprehensive instruction on the standards and targeted support for weaknesses in phonics, comprehension and fluency.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
The Literacy Leadership team will monthly examine walk-through data gathered from school leadership to look at both teacher, grade level, and school needs. As the data indicates, the ILC will be used for coaching individual teaching and Professional Development will be targeted for whole group needs of the faculty.	Hall, Rob, rob.hall@stjohns.k12.fl.us
Student data will be examined a a grade level and then at the whole school level to look for needed areas of adjustment and improvement. Results of the mid-year F.A.S.T. test and mid-year progress monitoring on BAS, Dibels, Foundations, and SIPPS will be used to direct support for Literacy Coaching and Professional Learning. Data will also be examined by the Literacy Leadership Team to look for needs by teacher, program, grade level, and school.	Groves, Bethany, bethany.groves@stjohns.k12.fl.us
Literacy Leadership will oversee Tier 1 instruction. The assessments in Tier 1 instruction will be based on the district pacing guides and supported through common planning completed in PLCs. Coaching will be provided to those teachers who demonstrate need as evidenced through observations, PLC discussions, and student data. Professional development will be provided to grade levels in a differentiated manner based on need.	Hall, Rob, rob.hall@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.

Webster offers and encourages regular opportunities for parents and families to engage with school. Our Community Partnership School also increases supports to families and encourages them to engage more deeply with school and its systems. Our school has used the PBIS system to create a positive environment that motivates and recognizes the positive choices for our students. Our students, teachers and parents are using this system extensively and consistently. The Wolverine Bucks are a hot commodity and students love earning them and then spending them at the school store or as a ticket to a fun event.

Last year, we started using a Webster Student Pledge that is a part of our morning announcements every day. It contains our PBIS behavior expectations and positive affirmations. Students have enjoyed memorizing it and sharing it around the community. This year, our PBIS team created shirts that have part of our pledge proudly displayed. They were unveiled at Open House already this year where over 500 attended and over 350 shirts were sold. Additionally, we have a parent involvement event once a month that combines student performance and celebration with parent information. These nights have grown in attendance and are becoming an important aspect of connection and engagement for our families. finally,

our PTO is starting to grow. We have gone from 3 to more than 20 parents involved in rekindling PTO and building momentum to create greater enrichment for families and students.

Finally, as a part of PBIS, our school is implementing Conscious Discipline principles and practices in every classroom. These practices, along with our Morning Meetings and Social Emotional Lessons that occur every day have helped to create a more caring environment in the school overall. Students are celebrated for their kindness and citizenship. Student jobs in every class and an increase of clubs both during school as well as before and after school have also helped to positively motivate students and have made our school a positive place to learn and thrive.

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

Darnitah Moultrie - School behavior specialist and leader of PBIS

Jessica Mead - Assistant Principal who oversees Ms. Moultrie and the PBIS system

Celeste Wright - parent & Teacher PBIS committee member

Michelle Becker - parent & Teacher PBIS committee member

Stephanie Colsant - teacher PBIS committee member

Cassandra Whitty - parent & behavior para

Julian Barnes - behavior para

Renata Russell teacher PBIS committee member

Bethany Groves - Principal, oversees implementation and coordinates with families, community, and district

Raleigh Burney - Community Partnership School Director and PBIS team member