Julington Creek Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Julington Creek Elementary School

2316 RACE TRACK RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

http://www-jce.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 JCE, we will provide quality instruction in core academics as well as additional opportunities for enrichment related to the arts, technology and overall wellness. We will emphasize character education and recognize children who demonstrate qualities of good character both at school and in the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

JCE…where children grow to be well-rounded people of character, innovative and college/career ready.

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
Reichenberg, Joy	Principal	
Hatcher, Melissa	Assistant Principal	
Frank, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Hillenbrand, Donna	Instructional Coach	
Foster, Valerie	Other	
Johnston, Dana	Other	

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.

SIP will be developed using data from the previous year's SAC needs assessment surveys for parents, teachers and staff. Academic and socioeconomic data from the previous year will also be used.

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))

Goals will be monitored through various forms of progress monitoring to include FAST assessments three times throughout the year, as well as attendance and behavioral data.

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	18%
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) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) 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: 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	18	14	8	13	11	13	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	4	6	4	3	3	2	0	0	0	22
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	9	7	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	3	7	0	0	0	13
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	

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	1	4	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	7	2	8	2	7	6	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	4	3	1	1	1	4	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	4	5	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	5	13	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	14	5	4	5	0	0	0	32

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	1	0	3	4	0	2	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	7	2	8	2	7	6	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	4	3	1	1	1	4	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	4	5	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	5	13	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	14	5	4	5	0	0	0	32

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	1	0	3	4	0	2	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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*	75	70	53	81	74	56	84		
ELA Learning Gains				71			70		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				69			60		
Math Achievement*	82	73	59	85	50	50	89		
Math Learning Gains				67			63		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			56		
Science Achievement*	77	69	54	76	77	59	77		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					69	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	57	66	59	100			92		

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	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	613
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	48			
ELL	74			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	53			
HSP	83			
MUL	84			
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	65			

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	50			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	67			
HSP	74			

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%
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	70			

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	75			82			77					57
SWD	39			52			40				4	
ELL	75			90							3	57
AMI												
ASN	71			84			70				4	
BLK	53			53							2	
HSP	79			77			88				4	
MUL	78			89							2	
PAC												
WHT	75			83			78				4	
FRL	61			68			69				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	81	71	69	85	67	64	76					100
SWD	53	55	61	62	40	42	38					
ELL	65	43		65	57							100
AMI												
ASN	83	86		83	75		77					

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
			2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS									
BLK	68	69		68	69	60						
HSP	74	80	73	79	73	73	67					
MUL	72	70		72	40							
PAC												
WHT	84	68	69	88	66	65	79					
FRL	79	72	72	82	63	56	69					

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
			2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS									
All Students	84	70	60	89	63	56	77					92
SWD	59	57	54	71	39	47	41					
ELL	71			76								92
AMI												
ASN	91			94			92					
BLK	46			46								
HSP	75	68		85	64	55	65					
MUL	79			93								
PAC												
WHT	86	68	57	91	61	58	78					
FRL	73	39		73	28		67					

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	75%	71%	4%	54%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	76%	0%	58%	18%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	81%	72%	9%	50%	31%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	90%	78%	12%	59%	31%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	79%	6%	61%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	83%	74%	9%	55%	28%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	77%	70%	7%	51%	26%

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.

We performed lower in ELA (78% proficiency in grades 3-5 combined) vs. Math (86% proficiency in grades 3-5 combined). When disaggregating by student, we found that our subgroup of SWD performed the lowest of all our subgroups.

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

N/A due to the FAST being a new assessment from the previous 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 it comes to a gap, JCE was on the positive end. We performed at 29% points above the state in ELA (grades 3-5 combined) and 31% points above the state in Math (grades 3-5 combined).

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

While it is not comparable to the FSA last year as that is a different assessment, we were able to show a correlation of growth from PM1 to PM 3 of +21% change in our general education population, and the growth of our SWD from PM1 to PM3 of +20% change in ELA.

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

Our main area for concern are our students performing at Level 1 on state tests, and our lowest quartile students.

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

Increasing proficiency in our SWD subgroup
Increased proficiency in ELA
Increased proficiency in Math
Reducing our disciplinary issues through positive support
Maintaining a positive school culture

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.

Districtwide, we are focused on increasing the proficiency of our SWD. While we are high performing, the students in this subgroup are still an average of 25 points below their general education peers in proficiency scores in ELA.

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

Using a method of scheduling provided by the Florida Inclusion Network, we have built our master schedule based on the needs of SWD. Included in this schedule are designated intervention blocks that will give additional time for students to receive their specialized instruction, while keeping them in the classroom for their grade level instructional blocks.

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

We will monitor the progress of this subgroup through the three progress monitoring windows throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joy Reichenberg (joy.reichenberg@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

For our SWD, interventions will be based on their IEPs. Teachers will be trained in various programs to meet their needs. Some of these programs include Wilson, Fundations, and the Intervention and reteach components of the Savvas ELA curriculum.

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

These programs are evidence-based and our teachers receive explicit training and instruction in their implementation.

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.

Master schedule will be built with our SWD and ESE program as a priority.

Person Responsible: Joy Reichenberg (joy.reichenberg@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Beginning of school year 2023.

All new ESE teachers will be trained in evidence-based interventions and programs used with our SWD.

Person Responsible: Melissa Hatcher (melissa.hatcher@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Within the first few weeks of school year 2023.

All teachers (general education and ESE) will receive direct training on providing appropriate accommodations for SWD based on the needs of their IEPs.

Person Responsible: Melissa Hatcher (melissa.hatcher@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Within the first month of school year 2023.

Students will have opportunities to attend intervention groups during the school year, lasting the entire year.

Person Responsible: Joy Reichenberg (joy.reichenberg@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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 proficiency is 29% higher in ELA than state performance, we would like to increase our capacity in that area.

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

Using research-based curriculum, employing high yield instructional strategies, as well as a prescriptive plan of scope and sequence, we will increase the overall reading proficiency of our students in grades 3-5 to 80% or higher.

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

Progress will be monitored through the use of Common Summative Assessments, as well as the FAST assessment throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joy Reichenberg (joy.reichenberg@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.)

District created curriculum maps and pacing guides, Savvas curriculum and resources, Wilson Fundations, as well as other high-yield strategies in our daily intervention block.

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

These programs have been thoroughly vetted by our district CAST team for efficacy. We have access to both the resource and the training support needed for solid implementation.

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.

Provide training opportunities for newly hired teachers in the various programs.

Person Responsible: Donna Hillenbrand (donna.hillenbrand@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: As needed throughout the year.

Provide professional learning to all teachers on high yield strategies - specifically targeted for ELA. This learning will be integrated into our weekly WOW Wednesday times.

Person Responsible: Donna Hillenbrand (donna.hillenbrand@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Students will participate in a series of common summative assessments, as well as three windows of progress monitoring throughout the year. Teachers will meet as PLCs to analyze data and intervene where necessary.

Person Responsible: Joy Reichenberg (joy.reichenberg@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

#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.

With rezoning and the addition of several new ESE classrooms last year, our school had a major time of transition with regards to discipline needs. Our administration sees this year as a time to increase the positive culture throughout our school.

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

In order to facilitate a decrease in disciplinary events, our school will increase the use of positive rewards and supports such as Good Jags referrals, motivational surveys, and Character recognition ceremonies.

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

We will track teacher involvement and compare disciplinary data from the previous year to this year in order to compare the efficacy of the program.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joy Reichenberg (joy.reichenberg@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.)

Using strategies from PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports), our administration will lead the teachers and staff in the use of the Good Jags referrals program. The administration will implement a monthly character recognition that involves students and families.

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

Providing more opportunities for students to receive attention for doing good things will encourage and incentivize them to repeat that positive behavior.

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 wide implementation of the Good Jags "ticket" program using QR codes and digital access for easier access and faster response.

Person Responsible: Melissa Hatcher (melissa.hatcher@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Launch at the beginning of the year and follow up throughout the year.

School wide implementation of a monthly character program that recognizes a star student from each classroom. This will include a ceremony for families to attend.

Person Responsible: Joy Reichenberg (joy.reichenberg@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Starting in September 2023 and recurring throughout the year.

For our students with repeated discipline issues, our administration and counselors will work on motivational surveys and goal setting to help those students work toward more positive outcomes.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Frank (jennifer.frank@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$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