

St. Johns County School District

Wards Creek 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

Wards Creek Elementary School

6555 STATE ROAD 16, St Augustine, FL 32092

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

Demographics

Principal: Kevin Klein

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	21%
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: B (59%) 2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (64%)
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

Wards Creek Elementary School

6555 STATE ROAD 16, St Augustine, FL 32092

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	21%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At WCES we ensure Achievement, Learning and Leadership for ALL.

Provide the school's vision statement.:

To build and sustain a culture that provides a safe environment where all stakeholders collaborate to ensure growth and achievement for ALL.

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
Klein, Kevin	Principal	Site-based manager of the school. Determines policies and procedures for all
Haynes, Julie	Assistant Principal	LEA for students on Access Points standards. Assist the principal in all aspects.
Baker, Kasey	Assistant Principal	LEA for students on General Education standards. Assist the principal in all aspects.
Hagan, Robie	Instructional Coach	Curriculum advisor for administration in professional learning opportunities for teachers, model instruction, MTSS team member.
Adolf, Leanne	School Counselor	Testing Coordinator, MTSS team member, Character Counts lessons

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/15/2021, Kevin Klein

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

2

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

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

71

Total number of students enrolled at the school

928

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

2

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

22

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	116	141	122	140	151	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	817
Attendance below 90 percent	12	11	8	11	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	6	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	3	9	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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 8/23/2022

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	99	89	116	118	109	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	649
Attendance below 90 percent	5	4	6	4	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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

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

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	5	4	9	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
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	99	89	116	118	109	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	649
Attendance below 90 percent	5	4	6	4	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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

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

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	5	4	9	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
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	73%	74%	56%				79%	75%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%						72%	67%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						65%	59%	53%
Math Achievement	72%	50%	50%				84%	77%	63%
Math Learning Gains	55%						74%	69%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						64%	59%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	77%	59%				72%	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	77%	78%	-1%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	79%	77%	2%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2022					
	2019	77%	76%	1%	56%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

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	85%	82%	3%	62%	23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	81%	82%	-1%	64%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
05	2022					
	2019	85%	80%	5%	60%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	72%	73%	-1%	53%	19%
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	34	45	27	42	35	26	15				
ELL	50			50							
ASN	90			90							
BLK	80			80							
HSP	64	69	56	62	44	31	36				
MUL	81	50		68	50		60				
WHT	73	63	44	74	58	41	69				
FRL	62	57	33	56	43	40	29				
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	41	31	38	48	40	33	40				
HSP	64	100		73	82		58				
MUL	70			70							
WHT	76	56	33	75	51	27	65				
FRL	65	48	40	63	48		48				
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	54	46	55	59	69	68	36				
ASN	75	82		92	100						
HSP	68	67		89	70		71				
MUL	92	86		81	50						
WHT	80	71	69	83	75	61	73				
FRL	68	67	65	79	71	47	67				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
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	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	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	90
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	80
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	52
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	62
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	46
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?

The percentage of students level 3 and above in reading is significantly lower for the subgroup of students with disabilities were significantly lower in percentage of students level 3 and above in reading, math, and science.

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

Reading and math learning gains, in addition to learning gains for both subjects in the lowest 25% Significant progress is needed in students with disabilities.

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

Tremendous growth in school size and not knowing the present levels of performance in the students. We need to provide more rigorous formative assessments and to truly embrace the Professional Learning Community process.

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

The subgroups of Asian, Black, and Multi-racial outperformed the students who are White.

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

Student demographic profile was not in the Free/Reduced lunch category.

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

Relevance within the essential standards and more rigorous assessments. Formative assessments upon introduction of a standard and skill and throughout prior to the summative assessment.

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.

Focus on Collaborative Learning Teams to identify essential standards. Work within Vertical Learning Teams to review grade level expectations in reading and math in each grade level. Differentiation strategies and thorough understanding of Bloom's Taxonomy and Webb's Design of Instruction.

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

More focus on small group instruction during instructional blocks. ESE subgroup monitoring and discussion of progress being made toward grade level standards.

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 Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:

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

With the rapid growth in student population, so has also the number of teachers hired. With grade levels having more teachers, teams must get to know each other and how to rely on each other for assistance. We must completely embrace the PLC concept.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teams will identify each quarter's essential standards in reading, math, and science to guarantee an understanding of the most important concepts.

Monitoring:

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

Frequent participation by administration in PLC meetings. More review of identified essential standards and lesson plans. Evidence of formative assessments being utilized.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Haynes (julie.haynes@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Book study reviews of DuFour's work involving best practices in PLC development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Hattie's effect size of significant increase in student learning when teacher efficacy occurs.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback/Walkthroughs

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	With an increase in feedback, teachers can better understand what best practice strategies would provide substantial increase in the students mastering the standards.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	District adopted evaluation system and more frequent in-person meetings to provide feedback and areas for growth.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Formal observations of an and increase in relevance and rigor of the teaching and more engaged student learners.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Klein (kevin.klein@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Marzano Placement and Bloom's Taxonomy
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Hattie's research on effect sizes
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.	
Feedback provided to teachers by use of the evaluation tool. In addition, coaching conversations with those who may need some additional support.	
Person Responsible	Kevin Klein (kevin.klein@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Behavior

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

The workplace that children will eventually be part of demands that they learn collaboration skills and hold a high level of character skills to be effective leaders. With the torch as our symbol, we believe that we need to to teach children and adults to "Shine their Light." (Leadership, Integrity, Growth Mindset, Heart, and Team)

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

The number of documented behaviors will be reduced from the previous year.

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

Quarterly reports on documented behavior referrals and classroom issues.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Haynes (julie.haynes@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

PBIS and Capturing Kids Hearts strategies, along with Character Counts lessons.

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

Students must learn how to collaborate to be successful in the workplace later in life. They must be able to recognize that their actions are often more important than their achievement. To do this, they must have a growth mindset and commitment to excellent behavior.

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.

Dedicated "family time" in the schedule. These lessons happen daily for 20 minutes.

Person Responsible

Kasey Baker (kasey.baker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. 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.

To close the achievement gap, students identified as having a disability in reading must make considerable learning gains in their quest to proficiency. Unfortunately this gap widened from the previous year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Learning Gains of Students with Disabilities in Reading will improve to 40%

Monitoring:

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

Frequent conversations with IEP case managers about the progress of students with disabilities. Review diagnostic information with them on a quarterly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kasey Baker (kasey.baker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students will receive daily reading support from a special education teachers. All teachers working with these students will use data to differentiate for their particular needs. Increase in Tier III MTSS focus within the homeroom teacher's classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

These are research-based strategies and are chose due to the research on effect sizes.

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.

Weekly conversations with the team regarding student improvement, based upon data.

Person Responsible

Kasey Baker (kasey.baker@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.

Beginning last year, the principal laid out a 3 year goal. The first year focused on relationships. Staff meetings consisted on teachers getting to know more about each other. With the incorporation of Capturing Kids Hearts strategies there was a tremendous emphasis on establish classroom culture through the development of a social contract. A dedicated 20-minute block was encouraged so that Character Counts lessons were incorporated in the daily routine. To even make this time more sacred in the second year, the comfortable recess schedule was changed so that grade levels would go together 40 minutes before lunch. This left a 20-minute period before lunch. This strategic idea was so that there would be no time for academics, and a true dedication to the "Family Time." Teachers are continuing to learn best practices that include, whole-brain teaching, love and logic, 7 habits of successful students, etc." The focus this year on the PLC process is also strengthening relationships amongst the faculty. The administration is working closely along with the PTO to have opportunities for families to join the school in events. Business partners also provide spirit nights.

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

The administration sets the tone of culture by being to recognize and respond to the current needs. During the summer there are intentional plans set in place to promote relationships and a positive learning environment. At pre-planning there are activities built in to have teachers interact with others. There is also a learning initiative in establishing the first two weeks of school as developing relationships with students and an understanding that they are a school family. The PBIS expectations and Social Contract within the classroom is established and agreed upon. Throughout the first weeks of school teachers also make positive phone calls to parents of their students. Within the school day it is intentional that "family time" occurs on a daily basis to discuss expectations.

Throughout the year, learning opportunities for teachers are established. At those times there are several team-building activities that take place to continue to promote getting to know others. The PTO and administration work closely over the summer to establish several after school activities to promote a school community.