

St. Johns County School District

Ketterlinus Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Ketterlinus Elementary School

67 ORANGE ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

<http://www-kes.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.

KES will accomplish the highest academic achievement possible for each of our students within a safe learning environment that is staffed by caring, highly qualified teachers and staff.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that “all children can learn and succeed” but not on the same day in the same way.

We believe that increased student achievement, along with school safety, should be our top priorities.

We support the six pillars of character as outlined in the Character Counts! Program.

We strive to build a true professional learning community.

We understand the critical connection between home and school.

While supporting high standards and the need for a core academic curriculum, we also believe in the theory there are multiple intelligences in human beings.

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
Allen, Pamela	Resource Teacher	PE Coach/Team Leader
Smith, Jaime		Positive Behavior Intervention System
Tucker, Kathy		
Golz, Heather		
Brush, Sue		
Tagliarini, Shari		1st grade teacher/grade-chair
White, Stephanie		
Wenglowsky, Maru		Third Grade Teacher/Grade-Chair
Killin, Larissa		Fourth Grade Teacher/Grade-Chair
Cumpton, Erin		Grade 5 ELA Teacher/Grade-Chair

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.

At the end of the prior year, KES Staff & Team advertise for chairs. The SAC team nominates and votes on selecting a person or two, to be SAC chair/co-chairs. At the beginning of the current school year, notices are sent via email and paper to parents & community members that would be interested in participating in SAC.

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))

FAST Progress Monitoring will be shared with school leadership team and grade-level, as well as SAC team.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	47%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A

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	3	5	6	4	10	5	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	3	4	3	6	9	8	0	0	0	33
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	5	11	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	5	11	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	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 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	0	0	3	4	8	0	0	0	0	15

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	3	4	8	0	0	0	0	15

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	68	70	53	70	74	56	75		
ELA Learning Gains				57			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			67		
Math Achievement*	75	73	59	77	50	50	76		
Math Learning Gains				67			60		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61			23		
Science Achievement*	67	69	54	64	77	59	58		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					69	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		66	59						

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	283
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	447
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
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	33	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	71			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	75			

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	51			

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	45			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	60			
HSP	84			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	53			

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	68			75			67					
SWD	28			44			17				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			52							2	
HSP	65			76							2	
MUL	50			60							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	74			79			69				4	
FRL	49			60			38				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	70	57	51	77	67	61	64					
SWD	33	48	39	49	58	50	36					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57			62								
HSP	94	75		94	73							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	69	57	46	76	65	54	64					
FRL	51	49	43	58	63	57	47					

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	75	65	67	76	60	23	58					
SWD	46	59		44	35		21					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45			15								
HSP	82			88								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	77	64		80	69		62					
FRL	51	54		55	42	10	32					

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	64%	71%	-7%	54%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	76%	-5%	58%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	69%	72%	-3%	50%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	79%	78%	1%	59%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	79%	-7%	61%	11%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	74%	-1%	55%	18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	61%	70%	-9%	51%	10%

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.

Students with disabilities made lower achievement in ELA, Math and Science (Gr. 5 only) and lower learning gains in ELA and Math. In addition, compared to 2019, students with disabilities in the lowest quartile in ELA made lower gains in 2022. Students with disabilities also had lower achievement in science compared to 2019.

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

The data components are based on FSA in which our state has eliminated. However, the data showed the need to improve with students with disabilities the in all areas measured.

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.

Ketterlinus has a significant number of ESE students in self-contained program for behavior as well as in general education. All students (& families) were impacted by the pandemic, but our students that were already significantly below level and families became very overwhelmed in being able to assist.

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

Math - math learning gains overall, math learning gains with the lowest quartile and students with disabilities in math. The school created "challenges" that could be done at home with or without parent involvement. School had extended learning opportunities offered for students in the area of math in grades 3, 4 & 5.

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

Students in Grade 4 in the area of attendance and ISS/OSS suspensions. In addition, Grade 5 students with ISS/OSS suspensions and level 1 on FSA.

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

The majority of EWS data are students with disabilities (SWD) in the area of all areas of academics. Priority to reading and math. Attendance is an issue in grades 4 & 5 with students with disabilities as well.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

All students would benefit from positive behavior intervention system. The pandemic created a time of isolation for many families. As a result, many of our students with disabilities and low income were deeply impacted.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Discipline referrals and crisis/counseling referrals will decrease.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom observations of lessons and procedures.

MTSS Core Team will review early warning signs (attendance, discipline, suspensions, MTSS/ESE referrals) for Tier 1 PBIS and Conscious Discipline implementation

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

PBIS and resiliency strategies as Tier 1 components.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students will benefit from resiliency to reduce absence, discipline and engage academic engagement.

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.

School has hired a behavior interventionist to assist school in coaching teachers and staff on positive behavior strategies. She will maintain a focus on specific subgroups (Students with Disabilities)

Person Responsible: Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

#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.

Continue our focus on ESE students in both math and ELA. Although we have shown gains in math, we have slipped a little in ELA achievement and Lowest Quartile Learning Gains with students with disabilities. The school has hired three additional staff members that are ESE certified to assist in ELA and Math. They will assist in providing services but focus on identifying areas of need and resources. One of the additional support is focused on early reading difficulties and is working with K-2 students who have had prior retentions, or at risk of retention, and/or two or more years behind in reading. This year, we have implemented blocks of schedules that are non-negotiable for all classrooms including our self-contained ESE programs. The blocks include required small groups, intervention groups and whole group time in which additional services cannot interrupt.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Both achievement and learning gains will increase. ELA learning gains will increase to 50%, and math learning gains will increase to 60%.

Monitoring:

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

FAST testing from PM1 to PM3
classroom observations through district's EEE program
District and school CSQ's (Common Summative Questions)
ESE Review Team meets once a month to review SWD not making growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@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.)

Targeted instruction in small groups
Goal setting for independent reading practices
Feedback from formative assessments (CSQ's) for small group and PLC instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students with disabilities would benefit from small group instruction and frequent monitoring.

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 school will implement monthly ESE review team meetings to go over data of SWD. A primary focus will students that are not making progress. Review team will make recommendations on services and accommodations or request additional data. However, team will review data of those that are making growth to ensure growth continues or review services/accommodations.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**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.

With higher student engagement, students will achieve higher academic achievements. Based on our data with our subgroups - students with disabilities which includes many of our students from poverty and are African American, our school wants to engage students more during the school day. The school finds it difficult to engage students afterschool, so we need to maximize our school day with small group intervention or enrichment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will continue to utilize our quarterly DRA, district's summative quizzes, state's FAST progress monitoring in ELA for all students that are underperforming in ELA/Reading. For math, our school will utilize both STAR Math, district summative quizzes and the state's FAST progress monitoring.

Monitoring:

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

Our MTSS/RTI and Literacy Leadership Team will review results and make recommendations. Administration will utilize district's EEE observation and state's literacy walk-throughs to ensure fidelity of high yield strategies are being implemented. ESE Review Team will review data specific to students with disabilities on a monthly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@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 majority of instructional staff had participated in a book study of "Poor Student, Rich Teaching" in 21-22 school year. This year, the Literacy Team and MTSS team will identify 4 high yield strategies that were identified in the book to be implemented.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The strategies that are selected are research-based in achieving at least a year's growth.

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.

Continue focus on (4) high yield strategies within classroom - specifically Marzano elements #11-14. Administration will continue weekly literacy walk-throughs to ensure more non-fiction and civics based literature is being implement . Feedback will be given to teachers using the EEE model.

Person Responsible: Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: early August through early May

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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.

It is our belief that all staff wants to improve and achieve higher student achievement. However, it is important (and difficult) to maintain a focus on implementing high yield strategies. Like students, our teachers require targeted instruction/professional development and feedback in order to implement high yield strategies and gain higher student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Both achievement and learning gains will increase. ELA learning gains will increase to 50%, and math learning gains will increase to 60%.

Monitoring:

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

FAST testing
classroom observations through district's EEE program
District and school CSQ's (Common Summative Questions)
ESE Review Team

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@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.)

Weekly walk-throughs during ELA. Feedback provided during on specific high-yield strategies through district's EEE observation model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

It is our belief that all staff wants to improve and achieve higher student achievement. However, it is important (and difficult) to maintain a focus on implementing high yield strategies. Like students, our teachers require targeted instruction/professional development and feedback in order to implement high yield strategies and gain higher student achievement.

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.

Weekly Literacy Walk-throughs and monthly (at minimum) observations using the district's EEE model to coach and provide feedback to staff. Differentiated coaching sessions will be provided based on observations of individual staff members. Review and approval of deliberate practices to reflect areas of

growth.

Feedback from Literacy Walk-throughs shared monthly at Literacy Leadership Meetings.

Person Responsible: Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Mid August through Early May. Deliberate Practices reviewed and approved by early September. Feedback given on a monthly basis. Feedback of Literacy Walk-throughs shared monthly beginning September.

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.

SIP will be presented at the School Advisory Council meeting as soon as it is approved (mid-November). Feedback was sought for this plan during the 22-23 SAC meetings.

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))

The school provides opportunities to be involved in the school on a daily basis through volunteering in classrooms but also grade-level initiatives such as fluency lab, at home challenges, and PTO events.

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)

The school provides at home challenges 2-3 times a year that focuses on academics as well as character or school-wide initiatives such as KES Amazing Race, Accelerated Reader, Character Counts!, Get Schooled Challenge, or Freckle Challenges. In addition, the school provides interpreters for families that speak another language so they can be involved. All parents are strongly encouraged to be part of our school's SAC and/or PTO.

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))

Our district homeless department, ASSIST, provides services to families that we have identified as homeless. They provide services that includes transportation, food, clothing and counseling.