

St. Johns County School District

James A. Webster 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

James A. Webster Elementary School

420 N ORANGE ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

<http://webster.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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, 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
Groves, Bethany	Principal	Oversees instructional and operating systems at school. Supports all aspects of learning for students and professional learning for teachers and staff.
Coates, Danielle	Assistant Principal	shares LEA responsibilities, supports ESE and supports the principal as the instructional leader
Simmons-Watson, LaShonda	Assistant Principal	shares LEA, supports ESE, and supports the principal as the instructional leader
Hall, Rob	Instructional Coach	supports teachers in professional learning, conducts coaching cycles, supports literacy, modeling, MTSS, and testing

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.

Feedback was received from teachers, staff, and parents regarding the previous year's instruction and performance. Using this feedback and state testing data, the school leadership team created a draft of

goals for the upcoming school year. These goals were shared with the 2023-2024 school staff, 23-24 SAC committee, and our current Community Partnership School staff and advisory committee for feedback and suggestions. After adjustments to the plan based on input of both staff and parents, a final draft was shared with all and submitted to the district for approval.

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))

At monthly leadership meetings, literacy committee meetings, grade level team leader meetings and SAC meetings, updates will be provided regarding progress in the SIP towards this year's goals. Additionally, at the end of Progress Monitoring 2 cycle, which occurs about mid-year, all school leadership with teachers gather together to review progress in regards to the current data. Adjustments are suggested and those most pertinent to school improvement are put into place along with amendments to the SIP.

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	43%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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)* 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: C 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 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	19	21	7	20	15	17	0	0	0	99	
One or more suspensions	4	0	4	8	8	10	0	0	0	34	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	15	2	3	0	0	0	21	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	9	23	0	0	0	39	
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.	0	0	0	39	36	30	0	0	0	105	

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	4	0	3	15	0	7	17	0	0	46

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	12	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	16	2	15	12	12	27	0	0	0	84	
One or more suspensions	0	4	5	1	3	8	0	0	0	21	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	3	12	0	0	0	25	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	8	24	0	0	0	41	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	8	17	0	0	0	31	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	8	24	0	0	0	41	

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	9	14	9	29	0	0	0	61

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	7	9	2	0	0	0	0	24
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	16	2	15	12	12	27	0	0	0	84	
One or more suspensions	0	4	5	1	3	8	0	0	0	21	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	3	12	0	0	0	25	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	8	24	0	0	0	41	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	8	17	0	0	0	31	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	8	24	0	0	0	41	

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	9	14	9	29	0	0	0	61

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	3	7	9	2	0	0	0	0	24
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*	47	70	53	44	74	56	44		
ELA Learning Gains				50			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			80		
Math Achievement*	54	73	59	52	50	50	54		
Math Learning Gains				55			60		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			67		
Science Achievement*	47	69	54	42	77	59	28		
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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	193
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	334
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	29	Yes	4	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	45			

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	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	58			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	47			

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	47			54			47					
SWD	27			31			20				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			48			18				4	
HSP	28			50							2	
MUL	64			55							2	
PAC												
WHT	55			57			55				4	
FRL	43			52			37				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	44	50	41	52	55	50	42					
SWD	25	38	33	36	48	59	31					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	51	43	41	48	38	42					
HSP	44	58		56	75							
MUL	31			69								
PAC												
WHT	53	48	32	57	55	58	42					
FRL	40	50	39	49	56	53	39					

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	44	56	80	54	60	67	28					
SWD	31	59	80	46	59	69	17					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	38		43	62		9					
HSP	45			55								
MUL	36			55								
PAC												
WHT	50	59		58	64		37					
FRL	41	57	70	50	58		22					

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	44%	76%	-32%	58%	-14%
03	2023 - Spring	45%	72%	-27%	50%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	51%	78%	-27%	59%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	79%	-24%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	58%	74%	-16%	55%	3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	44%	70%	-26%	51%	-7%

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.

Our students with disabilities continue to struggle the most at Webster, especially in the area of reading achievement. A new state assessment with new benchmark standards a year ago has contributed to the challenges for all students and teachers. Additionally having some of the most challenging ESE students from other schools being served at Webster also complicates the problem solving strategies when seeking to meet the learning needs of all students.

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

Again, the ESE students struggle most and had the greatest decline due to factors listed above. We also have operated off a predominantly pull out model for supporting ESE students in gen ed due to high numbers of students with a low number of teachers. We are examining this ratio and service model this year.

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.

When comparing to the 21-22 state data due to lack of availability yet to the 22 - 23 data, our overall reading students without disabilities are slightly outperforming those at the state on ELA achievement. The state is at 57% while Webster is at 59%. However our SWDs remain the same as the state at 21%.

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

Math achievement for both non-ESE and SWDs improved in the 21-22 school year due to an increase in interventions and targeted standards-based instruction.

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

Attendance is a concern and an area we need to address. Both student attendance and teacher attendance is in need of emphasis.

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

1. Focus on SWDs and the targeted interventions needed to increase both LG and proficiency.
2. Increase student and teacher attendance rates.
3. Focus on overall reading achievement in order to get over the 50% proficiency mark.

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 Teacher Attendance

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.

Our Teacher retention rate last year was excellent but about 20% of our teachers had absentee rates over the district contract allowed of 10 days. Many days we had several open jobs in which there were no substitutes. Classes had to be split and added to other classes or others had to be pulled from support jobs to cover general education classes and provide instruction. This has an impact upon instruction, student achievement, and student behavior.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Less than 10% of the certified staff will miss more than 10 days of work this year.

Monitoring:

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

Each month the school secretary will provide a report to the principal who will then share with each staff member's current progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bethany Groves (bethany.groves@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.)

Teachers will be provided opportunities to receive praise and recognition for work excellence and regular consistent attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Praise, encouragement, and recognition all have a positive impact on staff retention, overall job satisfaction, and desire to come to work.

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.

One teacher each week will be selected as the Wolverine Teacher of the Week based on staff recommendation, job performance, and attendance.

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

By When: This program begins in September and will run through the end of the year.

An attendance campaign that rewards classrooms and for consecutive days of perfect attendance, which includes the teaching staff, will be promoted September through May.

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

By When: The first month of monitoring begins in September.

#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.

Our SWD students continue to struggle. This is the 4th year we are on the ESSA clock for our SWDs being below 41% in years 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2022 which are the only count years due to COVID and the new test. We intend to do much deeper work around our SWDs to improve achievement and learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our SWDs will have a total school grade of 41% or greater this year as measured on the state assessment.

Monitoring:

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

We will use several systems to monitor and measure progress toward this goal and student achievement. First and primarily, we will use the state progress monitoring testing system to measure progress. We also will use several other progress monitoring systems including BAS reading levels, ORF through Dibels, district created common formative assessments, and reteach, retest systems to monitor mastery after reteaching.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bethany Groves (bethany.groves@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.)

We have coordinated support from all of our supporting district departments to gather together in a problem-solving and coordinated effort to support SWDs at Webster. Regular support for planning, differentiation, and strategies will be given to teachers and ESE teachers. Additionally, other assistance in data analysis, formative creation, and follow-up retests will be sought from the district team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Focused problem-solving and very specific, targeted interventions around benchmarks and standards is most effective for student growth. Additionally, helping limit the focus of teachers to the most urgent areas allows them to build skills and confidence around this area of improvement.

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.

Engage a problem-solving team to support the action steps needed and to share the work load to support teachers and administration in a more focused and deep manner.

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

By When: This group met for the first time on August 24, 2023. The next meeting is scheduled for September 5, 2023. Regular meetings will continue as the team assists in data analysis, problem analysis, planning, interventions, and assessments.

The ESE support facilitation team will meet on the third Wednesday of the month to look at ESE student progress monitoring data in grades 3, 4, and 5. Regular adjustments to each student's interventions will be made as indicated by data. We also will focus on progress towards mastery and identifying remaining areas where students still struggle.

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

By When: This will begin August 25, 2023, and proceed every month on the third Wednesday of the month from there.

Provide after-school tutoring to targeted students who are ESE, responding to instruction, but need more time.

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

By When: This will begin by the first of November when funds become available.

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).

Both the SAC Committee and Administration Team will review the SIP goals and allocations mid-year to examine progress on goals and funding responsibility. Adjustments will be made as needed in the SIP.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

Our K - 2 reading proficiency scores have been on a regular growth pattern for the last few years. This is due largely in part to the systematic use of Foundations in pre-K through 2nd grade. Lessons are given in Tier 1 and then interventions are provided to students who do not respond to Tier 1 instruction. This

year, greater attention will be given to more direct intervention to ESE students who are not responding. Also, K and 1st have about 50% of the students who are not yet ready to pass at a Level 3 on the 3rd grade exam. Intense monitoring and coaching will be provide to teachers whose data is still indicating instructional deficits. Students will be monitored through the state progress monitoring system, BAS reading levels, Dibels for 1st and 2nd, Foundations and SAVVAS unit tests.

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

Our 3rd and 4th grades from last year (4th and 5th) this year are still scoring below the 50% achievement level on the state assessment. 3rd grade scored at 42% and 4th grade scored at 43%. In upper elementary, many of the students still scoring below proficiency are our ESE students. More intensive support for these students in an inclusion support model will be delivered. Additionally, many of these students are still demonstrating lingering effects of COVID learning loss. Therefore, each student will be tested for phonics deficits which will then be remediated until mastery. Students will be monitored through the state progress monitoring system, BAS reading levels, Dibels fluency levels, Core Phonics survey results, SAVVAS unit exams, and district creative common formative assessments.

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

While all of our K - 2 grades scored above 50%, first grade was very close at only 51%. Each of these grades will have regularly monitoring with Tier 1 progress monitoring data and discussions with both grade level teachers and ESE support facilitation teachers. Adjustments to interventions will be made. Additionally, the two first grade teachers whose classroom data fell below the 50% line will be given additional monitoring and coaching support.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

3rd and 4th grade scored below the 50% mark at 42% and 43% respectively. In order to help them make the first step consistently over the 50% mark, we are looking more deeply at our ESE since a large portion of the students who are below proficiency are ESE. Our 3rd grade should be in better shape since our 2nd grade is coming in with 65% above the 40th percentile, although the tests are too new to yet determine how STAR and the BEST exam relate to one another. Regular progress monitoring discussions will occur with both grade level and ESE teachers about individual, class and grade level trends. Additionally, teachers new to Webster in grades 3, 4, and 5 will be given additional monitoring and coaching support.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Every grade level has a data spreadsheet that contains progress monitoring data that is analyzed every three weeks by admin, grade level teachers and ESE teachers. This data for reading includes state progress monitoring, BAS levels, Dibels levels, Foundations unit scores, SAVVAS unit scores, district common formative and summative assessments. Flexible groups are created around students who have not mastered recently instructed benchmarks. Additionally, the district problem solving team which is meeting monthly around our ESE students examine progress of ESE students in grades 3, 4, and 5 to make adjustments to interventions as needed.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Groves, Bethany, bethany.groves@stjohns.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

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

Foundations for grades Pre-K - 2nd grade

Direct and specific instruction around the benchmarks which includes teacher modeling, gradual release, lots of teacher monitoring and student feedback

In upper grades, teachers will center on instructional practices that emphasize comprehension strategies.

All teachers will continue to receive professional learning around the science of reading and strategies that instruct allow the 5 strands in developmentally appropriate methods. Additionally, we are supplementing school-wide with Lexia Core 5. All of these programs and interventions are aligned to benchmarks, our district comprehensive reading plan and are strong or moderate evidence-based practices.

Rationale:

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

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

Several practices have been chosen by our district as aligning with benchmarks and best practices. Foundations, Lexia Core 5, direct instruction in phonics and benchmarks have strong track record of effectiveness with Title 1 students.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
All admin and reading instructors will engage in regular professional learning around the science of reading and research-based reading strategies. Literacy leadership will engage with district leadership to schedule and provide appropriate learning around topics indicated by student data. Coaching will then be provided by the ILC and other district staff as identified through regular observations and walk-throughs. Assessment data will be monitored and increased teacher skill should begin to result in increased student performance.	Groves, Bethany, bethany.groves@stjohns.k12.fl.us
A unified approach to reading instruction and intervention, especially around students with disabilities will occur with key district staff and school literacy leadership. This team will meet regularly to discuss school needs, devise a plan of action, implement the plan using district and school resources, monitor and adjust the plan regularly as needed.	Groves, Bethany, bethany.groves@stjohns.k12.fl.us

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.

We review the main goals of the SIP at our Title 1 parent meeting and Open House in the fall. The plan is regularly created and monitored through our SAC Committee meetings and staff meetings. Progress and programs to support meeting goals are posted on our school website, Class DOJO, and updated at our monthly parent engagement events. Individual student progress is also communicated at a mandatory parent conference held in October with each parent. <https://webster.stjohns.k12.fl.us/parents/>

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))

Once a month we have a parent outreach night called WE CAN (Webster Elementary Community Access Nights).

These nights focus on informing our parents and school community about our goals and progress, engaging in family learning activities, and educating on topics of interest and importance. Students also perform at these events, dinner is provided, and they are upbeat and fun. Teachers all engage in regular positive phone calls home and regular communication about individual student progress is communicated in planners, on DOJO, through phone calls and conferences.

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)

Remaining dollars from the ESSA enrichment camp program will be used to continue to provide both tutoring and enrichment in after-school activities that center around academic remediation, exposure, and development. PBIS continues to go well to help students decrease off-task and inappropriate behaviors and to help increase learning time in the classroom. Finally, additional mentors, especially for new teachers, have been added part-time through district resources to make sure all classrooms are reaching high levels of instruction.

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 community partnership school provides regular support for this SIP plan. Several of the CPS goals align directly with SIP goals in order to maximize positive impact on overall student and school achievement.

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))

Using our MTSS Core team and individual student meetings, students who are struggling with academics, attendance, or behavior and indicates that they would benefit from counseling and/or mental health services are discussed. The team may then recommend a referral to the guidance counselor or our mental health counselor through our community partnership school. In extreme cases, the district social worker may help call in comprehensive family support through county services. We also may put in place a mentor or tutor to provide additional support, encouragement, and monitoring.

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))

Through our enrichment program, we have brought in several people to discuss their careers in space, science, nutrition, medicine, biology, and athletics. The purpose is content knowledge, but also career exposure and interest generation. We also hold a job fair each year with the intent of exposing students to a wide variety of careers that support their interest as well as spark new interest in new fields.

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).

Our MTSS team meets every Wednesday as a core to discuss school-wide monitoring data, school and grade level data, and individual students who may need further support. If referred for a possible Tier plan, a smaller team then meets to discuss student data, strengths and needs and then create a plan which is regularly monitored every 3 - 6 weeks depending on severity and intensity of student needs. We also use PBIS systems to support Tier 1 behavior with fidelity. This past year, 92% of our students found success at a Tier 1 level using PBIS strategies.

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 meet with grade level teachers every three weeks to engage in professional learning, common data analysis and to set up flexible intervention groups around common grade level assessments. Additionally, one early release planning a month is dedicated to staff development with an emphasis on instructional research based strategies and benchmarks.

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))

Our pre-k program helps students transition to kindergarten by providing an early start with phonics instruction. We have a pre-k district behavior specialist and an additional pre-k para to support helping students understand the behavioral expectations of school and early learning. We use the MTSS process to support struggling pre-ks. Also, we have an intensive Kindergarten class which is a general education class with smaller numbers and an additional adult for those pre-K students which need support and are not ready for the general education classroom without additional support.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Attendance	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes