Crookshank Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Crookshank Elementary School

1455 N WHITNEY ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Mission of the St. Johns County School District is to inspire good character and a passion for lifelong learning in all students, creating educated and caring contributors to the world.

Mission
The professional learning community at John A. Crookshank Elementary School is dedicated to collaboration in developing purposeful instructional delivery models. We work together to create intentional learning opportunities that develop the whole child and provide our students with the foundational skills and growth mindset to be both academically and socially emotionally successful. We celebrate individual accomplishments, value diversity, respect exceptionalities, and partner with our families to meet the unique needs of each student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To develop lifelong learners, nurturing collaborative critical thinkers.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Roach, Patrick	Principal	Patrick Roach is responsible for the maintaining a safe and orderly learning environment for all students, implementation of school-wide instruction for students, the school's budget, hiring of instructional and noninstructional personnel, the School Improvement Plan, PTO, School Advisory Council, building and maintaining community partnerships, teacher observations and MTSS/RtI 3rd-5th, PLC 3rd-5th. Other duties as they apply.
Thomas, Christi	Assistant Principal	Christi Thomas is responsible for serving as the LEA for PK- 5th Grade, MTSSS/RtI for PK- 2ndGrade, PLC K-2, Teacher Observations, Textbooks, Intern Placements, overseeing the Principal's Math Club, and overseeing the Summer Reading Program. School Safety, Paraprofessionals, Data Collection and Disaggregation, School Safety, Title I Representative.
Orta, Adriana	Instructional Coach	Adriana Orta is responsible for Teacher Coaching, Staff Professional Development, assist with Testing, supports the PLC process by attending weekly meetings with Grade Level Teams K-2, Curriculum Support, LLI & SIPPS Trainer, Facilitate and Coordinate the Spelling Bee and Tropicana Speeches. She also coordinates and ensures fidelity with our MTSS process. MTSS Meetings, RtI and intervention scheduling, volunteer tutoring.
Johnson, Joelle	Instructional Coach	Joelle Johnson is responsible for Teacher Coaching, Staff Professional Development, Testing Coordinator, supports the PLC process by meeting weekly with Grade Level Teams 3rd-5th. Curriculum Support, LLI & SIPPS Trainer, facilitate trainings for Schoology & Performance Matters, and Coordinate the Spelling Bee and Tropicana Speeches.
Benoit, Bailey	School Counselor	Bailey Benoit is responsible for 504 Plans, FAST - NGSS Testing, CELLA/ESOL Testing, Classroom Guidance Lessons, Mental Health-Social/Emotional Groups for students, Behavior Intervention Parent Resource-Migrant/Caretakers, Oversee Food 4 Kids programs, K-Kids, Holiday Food/Gifts for Families, Community Outreach- DCF/CHS, Attendance/Truancy meetings.
Martin, Anna	Psychologist	Anna Martin is responsible for the collecting and analyzing evaluation data for students and interpreting. the results for educators and parents during IEP meetings and for MTSS Meetings, as well as academic and behavior intervention for students on RtI plans. She also serves on the IEP and MTSS/Problem Solving team.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

As a leadership team, we spend time at the end of the previous school year (22-23), during summer and also preplanning discussing our school wide data, both current and historical, needs of students, service models and then map out our strategic plan. We bring in teachers/staff to discuss the implementation of the plan, next steps and services to meet our school wide goals. Parents and families get the opportunity to voice their input through SAC participation. All parties input is used to determine the best use of tangible and human resources to meet the needs of our students and move towards meeting our goals.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The goals, implementation plan and effectiveness of the plan will be embedded in our weekly CORE meetings. Data as it relates to the SIP will be discussed in our weekly grade level PLC(s). We will conduct two teacher data chats, one in September/October and the other in January. At these meetings, all students' (including subgroups) data will be discussed. We have restructured some of ESE services to include a combination of both push in and pull services. We will meet bi-weekly with the ESE team to discuss trends and students' response to the new delivery system.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	45%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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**	
Absent 10% or more days	28	27	23	12	24	20	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	3	6	2	2	6	8	0	0	0	27
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	3	8	9	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	14	19	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	20	29	0	0	0	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	28	28	29	42	31	0	0	0	160
	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	1	3	11	9	0	0	0	28

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	22	20	18	17	13	17	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	5	2	5	4	8	13	0	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	7	3	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	7	13	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	14	14	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	17	27	32	38	27	0	0	0	141

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	1	5	19	12	11	0	0	0	50

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	22	20	18	17	13	17	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	5	2	5	4	8	13	0	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	7	3	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	7	13	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	14	14	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	17	27	32	38	27	0	0	0	141

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	1	5	19	12	11	0	0	0	50

The number of students identified retained:

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

Header for Grade Level spans columns K–8.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	53	70	53	60	74	56	60		
ELA Learning Gains				60			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			68		
Math Achievement*	55	73	59	64	50	50	64		
Math Learning Gains				60			52		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			39		
Science Achievement*	49	69	54	50	77	59	37		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					69	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		66	59				64		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	210
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	21	Yes	4	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	50			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	59			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	48			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	3	
ELL	25	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	53			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	54			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	53			55			49					
SWD	23			28			12				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			38			35				4	
HSP	55			48			33				4	
MUL	67			52							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	59			63			59				4	
FRL	47			51			43				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	60	60	50	64	60	48	50					
SWD	36	38	32	46	46	33	24					
ELL	8			42								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39	44	44	51	45	42	20					
HSP	42	53		48	65		58					
MUL	67			73								
PAC												
WHT	70	67	52	71	65	48	58					
FRL	53	56	48	61	61	48	48					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	60	59	68	64	52	39	37					64
SWD	35	46	68	47	44	33	20					
ELL	39			50								64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	42		40	21	21	4					
HSP	53	70		56	50		45					64
MUL	70			40								
PAC												
WHT	70	66	67	76	64		51					
FRL	48	44	47	53	39	30	21					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	52%	71%	-19%	54%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	76%	-15%	58%	3%
03	2023 - Spring	54%	72%	-18%	50%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	53%	78%	-25%	59%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	79%	-14%	61%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	55%	74%	-19%	55%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	47%	70%	-23%	51%	-4%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

SWD ELA achievement scores are still not where they need to be as we dipped from 36% to 28%. A contributing factor could be the staff instability on our 5th grade team during the 22-23 school year. Although the team pulled together, we had 2 of our 5 5th grade teachers leave during the school year. The impact was felt. The consistent use of and implementation of the resources used by some of our service providers. The format of the assessment, moving from paper based to an online format as well as how the test was presented to students.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

SWD ELA Achievement data showed the greatest decline. As mentioned above, the contributing factors could be staffing issues through January, effective implementation of resources, service setting and the presentation mode of the assessment, switching from paper based to an online format.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Comparably we were above the state in overall Reading Proficiency average 3rd-5th, 3rd grade, and 4th grade specifically. However, we were 3 pts below the state average in 5th grade 52% CES compared to 55% at the state level. In Math Proficiency, we were above or equal to the state average in 4th and 5th grade, but 6 pts below the state average in 3rd 53% CES compared to the state average of 59%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Historically our areas of improvement have been in our growth scores in reading and math, including our students with disabilities. With last year's state assessment not including these categories, we remained close to our 21-22 data points in the categories of Reading and Math Proficiency/Achievement.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

1. Students absent 10% + increased from 107 students to 134 students.
2. Increase in the number of 3rd-5th grade students scoring level 1 on state ELA assessment. 21 to 53 students
3. Students with substantial reading deficiencies increased from 141 to 160 students.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. SWD Reading Achievement
2. School wide Reading Achievement at all grade levels
3. Reading Achievement of our African American/Black students
4. Increase 5th Grade Science Proficiency, decreased from 50% to 47%

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We experienced a dip in our SWD reading proficiency, 40% to 28% as well as an overall dip in our 3rd-5th grade reading proficiency, from 60% to 56%. As a response, we are turning our professional development focus to small group learning centers inside our general education classrooms. We will address this focus by offering grade level opportunities in our PLC meetings for colleagues to share and discuss small group learning. Also, as part of our PD plan, we intended to use peer focus walks during PLC time as well. These walks will give teachers the chance to see how their colleagues implement and use targeted instruction within their small groups. We also have allocated two Reading Interventionist positions, K-2 and 3-5. In addition to the second RI, we will strategically use three general paras to service students who scored Level 1 or 2 on the FAST. We will use tutors to meet the needs of our incoming Kindergarten students. The use of flexible/fluid grouping for targeted intervention and enrichment. The used blended learning via Lexia Core 5 for Reading and Dreambox Math for Math. The continued use of MTSS, formative and summative data to identify students and prescribe targeted interventions.

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

The measurable goal outcomes are:
increase of Reading Proficiency at 3-5 from 56% - 61%.
decrease the percentage of 3-5 students scoring below a level 3 from 44% - 39%.
increase in the amount of time grade level PLCs discuss small group learning centers. (Documented in PLC notes)
increase the number of PD offering, specifically targeting small groups. Min 5
decrease the number of K students scoring below 40 percentile on STAR Literacy from 30 to 18 (40%)
decrease the number of 1-2 students scoring below 40 percentile on STAR Reading from 57 to 34 (40%)

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

PLC meetings
MTSS/RtI meetings
Two teacher data chats
Data tracking by classroom teachers and Reading Interventionists
Midyear data dig - leadership team
Classroom observations - informal and formal

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The use of researched reading/phonics programs: Lexia Core, Wilson (Fundations), Wilson Reading System, Guided Reading, LLI (following District/State guidelines). The use of adopted ELA curriculum for both whole and small group interventions. The strategic and consistent analysis of data during PLC(s).

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

We selected and use the above reading/phonics programs because they been thoroughly vetted and are researched based. We believe strongly in the PLC process as a strategy to create targeted and purposeful interventions that focus on individual students as well as subgroups of students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

The effectiveness and use of small group instruction in the classroom as well as grade level grouping will be actively monitored in PLC meetings, MTSS/RtI meetings, teacher data chats, via data tracking by classroom teachers and Reading Interventionists, Midyear data dig exercise by leadership team, classroom observations - informal and formal. People responsible: Patrick Roach, Christi Thomas, Adriana Orta, Joelle Johnson

Person Responsible: Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 2023 January 2024 March 2024 June 2024

#2. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

As mentioned, we experienced a dip in our SWD reading proficiency, 40% to 28%. As a result, we are moving towards a push in and pull-out service model based on the needs of each student. Starting in March 2023, we met with FIN (Florida Inclusion Network), NEFEC to create an ESE service scheduled that grouped students based on their specific needs, but also considered change of setting for each student. Like general education teachers, our ESE teachers will have an opportunity to meet with their colleagues during grade level PLC to share and discuss small group learning. ESE teachers will participate in peer classroom walks. ESE teachers will work closely with our Instructional Literacy Coaches, Reading Interventionists and paras to develop high quality and organized intervention groups and strategies.

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

The measurable goal outcomes are:
increase percentage of SWD who score at 3 or above from 28% to 41%
increase the percentage of SWD who score above the 40 percentile on STAR Early Literacy from 36% to 45%
increase the percentage of SWD who score above the 40 percentile on STAR Reading from 54% to 61%

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

We will have biweekly meetings with the ESE team to check student progress and implementation of prescribed interventions. ESE teachers will participate in two dedicated data chats during the school year. ESE teachers will participate in grade level PLC(s), including focus peer walkthroughs as well as being available during grade level.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The use of researched reading/phonics programs: Lexia Core, Wilson (Fundations), Wilson Reading System, Guided Reading, LLI (following District/State guidelines). The use of adopted ELA curriculum for small group interventions. The strategic and consistent analysis of data during PLC(s).

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

We selected and use the above reading/phonics programs because they been thoroughly vetted and are researched based. We believe strongly in the PLC process as a strategy to create targeted and purposeful interventions that focus on individual students as well as subgroups of students. Including ESE teachers in these discussions are valuable for both the ESE teachers and the classroom teachers.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Focused data conversations about our subgroup of SWD in weekly CORE meetings, grade level PLC(s), ESE Team meetings and individual team meetings. People Responsible: Patrick Roach, Christi Thomas, Adriana Orta, Joelle Johnson.

Person Responsible: Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 2023 January 2024 March 2024 June 2024

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Create and a maintain a positive school wide culture that fosters the retention and recruitment of teachers and staff to John A. Crookshank.

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

The measurable goal outcomes are:
the retention of at least 92% of the instructional staff
the retention of at least 90% of all staff members

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

Midyear new teacher meetings, end of year meetings, SAC survey, team leadership meetings with feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Administration and Leadership team support for teachers, new teacher cadre meetings, teacher mentors for new teachers, empowering teachers to succeed through PLC support, cultivate collaboration through PLC, and leadership opportunities and provide relevant professional development opportunities. We will also recognize our teachers and staff with special days like We Love You Wednesday and initiatives such as You've Been Caught ROARing via our PBIS Rewards program.

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

We selected these strategies based on district HR feedback, staff surveys and best practices.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Administration and Leadership team support for teachers, new teacher cadre meetings, teacher mentors for new teachers, empowering teachers to succeed through PLC support, cultivate collaboration through PLC, and leadership opportunities and provide relevant professional development opportunities.

Person Responsible: Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

#4. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

To improve on the practice of our PLC process, specifically in the areas of data analysis, targeted interventions through small group learning centers and grade level flexible grouping.

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

The measurable goal outcomes are:
increase the ELA Proficiency on the 3rd-5th FAST from 56% to 61%
decrease the percentage of students scoring below a level 3 on the FAST 3rd-5th assessment from 44% to 39%
identify students in need of additional support through the RtI process.
increase the number of students scoring above 40 percentile on STAR Early Literacy from 64% to 69%
increase the number of African American/Black students scoring above 40 percentile on STAR Early Literacy from 50% to 55%
increase the number of students scoring above 40 percentile on STAR Reading from 67% to 73%
increase the number of African American/Black students scoring above 40 percentile on STAR Reading from 67% to 72%

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

PLC meetings, MTSS/RtI meetings, two teacher data chats, Data tracking by classroom teachers. ese teachers and Reading Interventionists, Midyear data dig - leadership team, Classroom observations - informal and formal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The use of a consistent PLC format that looks at data to determine the instructional strategies needed to meet the needs of individual students and groups of students, as well the guiding questions of a PLC What do we expect students to learn? How will we know if they learned it? How will we respond when some students do not learn? How will we extend the learning for students who are proficient? The discussion of research based instructional strategies in PLC and use of strategies will help teachers and teams streamline their instruction.

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

We have a strong belief that the PLC process adds instructional and collegial value to grade level teams as well as individual teachers. The sharing of instructional best practices based on data in turn impacts the quality of instruction our students receive. PLC help teachers create purposeful lessons that target the specific needs of groups of students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

We will conduct consistent and focused data conversations about all of our students, with an added focus on our SWD, Tier 2 & Tier 3 students. This will take place via grade level PLC, ESE Department meetings, Individual teacher data chats, MTSS Core and Administration Team meetings.
Scheduling times during PLC to give teachers the opportunity to observe colleagues implementing intentional small group learning centers.
People Responsible: Patrick Roach, Christi Thomas, Adriana Orta and Joelle Johnson.

Person Responsible: Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 2023 January 2024 March 2024 June 2024

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Create a positive school wide climate through consistently encouraging students to meet our school wide expectations by practicing and exhibiting our Guidelines for Success. Personal Best, Act Responsibly, Work Together, Show Respect

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

The measurable goal outcomes are:
a decrease in Tier 1 behaviors, keeping students in class.
reduce the number of office discipline referrals by 15%
increase the number of students who participate in our quarterly reward celebrations by 20%
increase the number of peer recognitions between faculty and staff members by 20%

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

In admin and MTSS CORE meetings, we will actively discuss the discipline and positive award data to help us make purposeful decisions in regard to our desired outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

For our school wide expectations, we will implement the ideas and strategies of PBIS to encourage students. We will also promote the pillars of Character Counts!. For classroom implementation, we will encourage the use of Kagan Strategies as well as the CHAMPs system.

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

CES will continue to build on our established PBIS plan to decrease administrative involvement in classroom management and to decrease the loss of instructional time due to Tier 1 behaviors. When used with fidelity, PBIS and Kagan strategies are proven to bring behavioral and decision-making success for students. Character Counts! is a highly successful global program encouraged by the district and embraced by CES.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Throughout the year, we will recognize positive behavior of both students and teachers. Cougars with Character quarterly awards, PAWS celebrations as part of our P.A.W.S. incentive program, We Love You

Wednesday for faculty and staff, Faculty and Staff Peer Recognition - You've Been Caught ROARing! Monthly Faculty and Staff - Early Release Host Wednesdays - Potlucks, Monthly lunch and t-shirt winners through our You've Been Caught ROARing! reward system. People Responsible: Patrick Roach, Christi Thomas and Jahmel Miller.

Person Responsible: Christi Thomas (christi.thomas@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 2023 January 2024 March 2024 May 2024

#6. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the students included in our ELL subgroup, as a school we are below the 41% proficiency expectation for ELA.

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

The measurable outcome for our ELL students would be to increase our ELA Grade 3-5 Proficiency to 41%.

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

We will actively monitor our ELL subgroups, tracking desired outcomes through our MTSS Core team, administrative discussions with our CES Instructional Literacy Coaches and Reading Interventionists, as well as data and student specific discussions in grade level PLC. We have also scheduled two purposeful and strategic data chat sessions with every teacher this year. Our ILC and reading support staff will regularly meet with teachers who have ELL students in their classrooms. We will also partner with our ELL district support for best practices and strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The use of research-based reading & phonics programs: Heggerty, Lexia Core, SAVVAS core curriculum and interventions and Imagine Learning. Students will receive district ELL small group interventions and support. Grade level teachers, including teachers with ELL students, will participate in data focused PLC meetings to determine the instructional strategies to meet the needs of our ELL students.

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

We selected the above reading/phonics programs because they have been thoroughly vetted and are researched based. We have a strong belief that the PLC process adds instructional and collegial value to grade level teams as well as individual teachers. The sharing of instructional best practices based on data in turn impacts the quality of instruction our students receive.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

We will conduct consistent and focused data conversations about our subgroup of ELL. This will take place via grade level PLC, ESE Department meetings (if applicable), Individual teacher data chats, MTSS

Core and Administration. Students will be part of tutoring groups to meet their specific needs. Team responsible - Patrick Roach, Christi Thomas, Adriana Orta and Joelle Johnson.

Person Responsible: Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Throughout the school year, the leadership team analyzes multiple student data sources (academic and behavioral) to determine personnel decisions as well as the implementation of programs/initiatives, like reading and math tutoring and interventions. The leadership team makes efforts to include our SAC team in the decision process along the way. Last year, through this process, we offered before school tutoring to our K-3 struggling readers. We made the decision to use funding for an additional Reading Interventionist. We offered a Science and Writing camp to our rising 4th and 5th grade students. We restructured our ESE service allocations to ensure each grade level was appropriately covered. We used grant money to offer students a robust and creative positive reward system through our school wide PBIS program.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The 23-24 SIP document will be available on our school website. It will be included in our weekly family newsletter and copies will be made available in the front office. We will present the final SIP to our SAC team.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Our 23-24 plan will include multiple parent and family events (academic and engagement) that support our school wide mission. Our goal is to have a minimum one event per month to encourage and build the school to home partnership. The Family Engagement Plan will be located under For Parents & Students - Information for Parents.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

We are restructuring our ESE service delivery to include both push in and pull out. ESE teachers will meet with their general education colleagues during grade level PLC to share and discuss small group learning centers and best practices. ESE teachers will participate in peer classroom walks. ESE teachers will work closely with our Instructional Literacy Coaches, Reading Interventionists and paras to develop high quality and organized intervention groups and strategies. ESE teachers will participate in grade level flexible grouping.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

This school wide ESE plan was developed based on our current standing with our SWD. This subgroup continues to be one of our areas of focus. The plan is supported by FTE funding as well as federal grants.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Through our weekly CORE team meetings, we address students in need of counseling, mental health services, specialized support services and mentoring services. After students are identified, our School Counselor works closely with our assigned district Social Worker and Mental Health Counselor to provide these services. We also work with Children's Home Society to provide our students and families with Health, Dental and Mental Health services when available.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

In 3rd - 5th grades, we instill the values and strategies of the nationally recognized AVID program. Within the AVID program, we work with and encourage post-secondary schools and local businesses to participate in our Career and College fair. When possible and applicable, we expose our students to workforce opportunities through career events.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Through our weekly CORE meetings, we review school wide behavior, drilling down to specific students. After reviewing, we level the students in accordance with the type of behavior they are presenting. Based on the behaviors, we provide both students and teachers with support services. Teachers via classroom support provided by our Behavior Interventionist and Administration Team. Students receive support via Tier 1 support, targeted Tier 2 or Tier 3 behavior support or IEP behavior goals.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

We created our professional learning calendar based on a 22-23 teacher PD survey, formal and informal observations throughout the school year, district initiatives and feedback from teachers/staff. Based on all these data sources, our professional learning focus will continue to be PLC(s) as well as using high yield instructional strategies to engage students and the implementation of small group learning centers inside general ed. classrooms.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

At the beginning of each school year, we offer a Kindergarten orientation. We also give our PK students, who will be transitioning to our Kindergarten program, an opportunity to visit Kindergarten classrooms. We also have our PK students visit and participate in Kindergarten activities. We encourage our Kindergarten teachers to visit PK classrooms.