

St. Johns County School District

R. B. Hunt 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	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

R. B. Hunt Elementary School

125 MAGNOLIA DR, St Augustine, FL 32080

<http://www-rbh.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.

We at R. B. Hunt Elementary School believe that all children can learn. We will provide children with a supportive, caring environment that develops self-esteem, self-motivation, and a sense of responsibility. We strive to provide every opportunity for maximum student achievement and to recognize and stimulate special talents in all students. The educational environment and the teaching strategies are designed to meet the goals and objectives of a strong curriculum. Our major goal is to prepare students to become responsible citizens and to take their place as productive members of the community. We believe that education is a cooperative effort among home, school, and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Learning and Working Together

As an R. B. Hunt elementary School Student, it is my responsibility to:

- * Respect myself and the rights and property of others.
- * Attend school every day and be on time to all classes.
- * Come to school prepared with all materials and assignments.
- * Obey the directions of all R. B. Hunt Staff members.

As an R. B. Hunt Elementary School Staff Member, it is my responsibility to:

- * Provide a quality instructional program for each student.
- * Provide an orderly classroom and safe school environment.
- * Develop programs and activities which will respond to the social, emotional, personal, and physical developmental needs of each student.
- * Assist parents in helping their children develop self-discipline, self-respect and self-confidence.

As the parent of an R. B. Hunt School student, it is my responsibility to:

- * Send my child to school each day on time, well-rested, and properly dressed.
- * Communicate regularly with my child's teacher regarding my child's social and academic needs and growth.
- * Check my child's work and homework daily.
- * Provide my child with support for learning which includes homework, help, a set time and place for homework and project work, and the supplies needed to complete assignments.

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
Garman, Amanda	Principal	Responsible for all aspects of the school
Larson, Alice	Assistant Principal	Serves as school LEA, works with the principal to provide a quality school environment.
Eyestone, Heather	Instructional Coach	Works with teachers to assist them in providing for each child's needs.
Kledzik, Raymond	Other	Works to provide a safe and clean learning environment for students and staff.

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.

School Advisory Council provides input and direction for the school leadership team. Stakeholders include: community members, parents, teachers and administration.

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))

SIP plan will be monitored by the SAC committee as well as by the MTSS Core 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	14%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	28%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No

<p>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)</p>	<p>Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)</p>
<p>School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	<p>2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A</p>
<p>School Improvement Rating History</p>	
<p>DJJ Accountability Rating History</p>	

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	12	10	9	6	5	15	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	4	3	2	0	0	0	11
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	2	16	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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.	11	21	5	16	10	0	0	0	0	63

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	2	5	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	10	9	5	7	11	7	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	8	0	0	0	20
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	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	10	9	5	7	11	7	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	8	0	0	0	20
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	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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*	79	70	53	78	74	56	79		
ELA Learning Gains				60			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			60		
Math Achievement*	82	73	59	83	50	50	76		
Math Learning Gains				79			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63			70		
Science Achievement*	69	69	54	72	77	59	79		
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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	309
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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	475
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
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	53			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK				
HSP	64			
MUL				
PAC				

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%
WHT	79			
FRL	67			

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	39	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	77			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	61			

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	79			82			69					
SWD	42			63			50				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	50			90							2	
BLK												
HSP	57			71							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
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	82			82			71				4	
FRL	67			72			57				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	78	60	40	83	79	63	72					
SWD	36	28	27	55	51	45	33					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	79	64		84	82							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80	60	44	85	80	66	72					
FRL	62	46	36	78	78	65	60					

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	79	61	60	76	54	70	79					
SWD	55	50		53	36		57					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	67			67								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	82	64	71	78	57	72	79					

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
FRL	66	60		66	67		73					

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	82%	71%	11%	54%	28%
04	2023 - Spring	83%	76%	7%	58%	25%
03	2023 - Spring	80%	72%	8%	50%	30%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	87%	78%	9%	59%	28%
04	2023 - Spring	93%	79%	14%	61%	32%
05	2023 - Spring	79%	74%	5%	55%	24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	70%	70%	0%	51%	19%

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 continue to fall behind in both reading and math compared to their non-disabled peers. Percentage of level 3 and above for nondisabled students was at 82 % for reading and 86 % for math. Students with disabilities were only at 48% proficiency in ELA. Math percentages were not available at this time. While we saw disabled students making a high level of growth, we have not closed the gap completely. We fell below the 41% threshold for SWD in schoolyear 21-22. Previous years data had SWD achievement at 55% in 20-21 and 62% in 18-19. Based on growth from last year, if that year counted, I believe we would have been out of ATSI status. Because SWD growth seemed to be quite good.

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

Students with disabilities K-2 went down from 79% proficiency to 73% for the third progress monitoring period. Information for math was not available to review at this time.

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.

R. B. Hunt was well above State and district averages for both ELA and math.

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

Growth for both ELA and math from progress monitoring period 1 to 3 was outstanding. Looking at individual student growth, especially with disabled student's growth was good, and we are proud of that, but overall they are not where non-disabled peers are.

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

Attendance rates for 5th grade, Kindergarten and first grade are above 10%.

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

1. Continued growth for all students, especially ESE students
2. Reduced rates of referrals to office for discipline
3. Increase rates of attendance.

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

While our school in general performs well and growth is made throughout the year there is a gap that remains between students with disabilities and those who are in general education.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our Goal is that students with start to close the gap by raising the proficiency level from 36% to 41% in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

Through the FAST testing, MTSS Team and meeting of I.E.P. goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Garman (amanda.garman@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.)

Students with disabilities will be scheduled first and the master schedule will revolve around their needs. Students will utilize targeted based interventions approved by the St. Johns County School district during I.E.P. service times and during afterschool tutoring activities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Approved for use by the school district these interventions are researched based and approved.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Scheduling ESE students first

Person Responsible: Amanda Garman (amanda.garman@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Before school begins, using FIN

Training ESE and afterschool tutors on research based interventions

Person Responsible: Heather Eyestone (heather.eyestone@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: By end of first 9 weeks of school

Set up afterschool tutoring to address ESE needs and students in MTSS Tier II and III

Person Responsible: Alice Larson (alice.larson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Before end of first 9 weeks

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

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.

Instructional practice. Grade level teams will meet weekly to plan collaboratively to meet the needs of all students. They will use the PLC time to look and examine data with a focus on SWD. They will utilize "intervention" blocks to provide targeted instruction to fill in learning gaps.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Grade level teams will function as a grade level PLC and collaborate to provide a guaranteed and viable curriculum for their students. SWD will grow each time they do progress monitoring. Data will be examined to assist in student instruction by teams.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators will attend teacher Wednesday PLC team meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Garman (amanda.garman@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.)

Teams will review student data and utilize the intervention blocks to address individual student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This will allow targeted interventions and acceleration to better meet student needs.

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.

Meet with faculty and discuss expectations for P.L.C.'s , grade level lesson planning and use of intervention blocks.

Person Responsible: Amanda Garman (amanda.garman@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Pre-Planning

Set a schedule for monitoring PLC's and minutes of meetings.

Person Responsible: Alice Larson (alice.larson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: By September 1

#3. 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.

Positive Culture and Environment. We will utilize our P.B.I.S. program with CKH and our Liveschool points and incentives to keep SWD engaged and excited about school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Rate of referrals to the office for discipline infractions will decrease by 25%. Data of SWD will be tracked closely to see if Behavior Intervention plans need to be created for them.

Monitoring:

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

By data entered into eschool and compared to last year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Garman (amanda.garman@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.)

P.B.I.S. program and use of "Capturing Kids Hearts" strategies used by the staff.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We believe that strong teacher student relationships can prevent many disruptions in class and create harmony in the school.

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.

Attend P.B.I.S. and Capturing Kids hearts training. Review and set expectations for staff during pre-planning.

Person Responsible: Amanda Garman (amanda.garman@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Before school starts for students.

Monitor the use of CKH and use of social contract, and other items related to CKH.

Person Responsible: Heather Eyestone (heather.eyestone@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year. End of year data and behavior intervention plans will be reviewed.

#4. 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.

Teachers need to feel the joy in connecting with students and learn to build positive relationships with their students. These relationships will help connections with SWD and their teachers. A mutual understanding and respect is the ultimate outcome.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teachers through the SIP survey will positively answer questions regarding their satisfaction with the profession and their relationships with their students.

Monitoring:

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

Climate surveys

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Garman (amanda.garman@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.)

P.B.I.S. School, Capturing Kids Hearts program, Liveschool and support throughout the year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers need to remember the why behind their chosen career.

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.

Set up ongoing PD in P.B.I.S. Liveschool, and C.K.H.

Person Responsible: Heather Eyestone (heather.eyestone@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: By September 1

Follow up and schedule ongoing PD with CKH company

Person Responsible: Amanda Garman (amanda.garman@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: By October 1

Survey teachers about school climate and make adjustments as needed.

Person Responsible: Alice Larson (alice.larson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: December

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).

ESSER funds will be utilized to target ESE students to work on skills in order to increase their learning gains and levels to meet regular education students level of achievement and to close the gap between the two. We will utilize tutoring during the day with Tier II and Tier III students as well as an afterschool tutoring program for ESE students.

ESSER funds were used to train staff on Capturing Kids Hearts, to work alongside our P.B.I.S. program.