
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	29
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Sebastian Middle School

2955 LEWIS SPEEDWAY, St Augustine, FL 32084

<http://www-sms.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.

Sebastian Middle School will inspire good character and a passion for lifelong learning in all students, creating educated and caring contributors to the world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sebastian Middle School's vision is to cultivate high achieving, college and career ready students who excel in a complex and changing world.

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
Gabaldon, Kirstie	Principal	<p>The principal ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards.</p> <p>Responsibilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Guide the collaborative PLC cycle of formative assessment/intervention -Coaching support for research based best practices - Supports the idea of Personalized Learning - Develop a culture that integrates STEM learning across curriculum
Gamble, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal is an extension of the Principal to support the vision and mission of the school as well as collaborate with teachers, parents, and students to ensure student achievement.</p>
Tagliarini, Darrin	Other	<p>Plans, coordinates and provides guidance sessions to meet the identified guidance and counseling needs of students in the areas of academic achievement, educational development, and personal and social development. Assist students in developing decision-making skills and identifying life goals.</p>
Hayes, Kevin	Dean	<p>Promotes positive behavioral change in students; provides supportive interventions to families and/or students; and complies with school behavior intervention policies, regulations, and/or procedures. Promotes positive school culture by utilizing restorative practices.</p>
Smith, Recia	Instructional Coach	<p>To generate improvement in instruction and student achievement by conducting on-site, on-going literacy- related professional development; modeling best practices; assisting teachers in analyzing student performance data for differentiated instruction; and supporting school-wide progress monitoring programs.</p>

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.

Stakeholders are an important component of the school community. They provide feedback during the School Improvement Process (SIP). Their input is provided through the School Advisory Council (SAC) where components of the SIP are shared along with data to support the decisions made for continuous improvement.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of all students with a focus on those students with the greatest achievement gap.. Data will be analyzed and used to adjust strategies during PLC's, grade level meetings, faculty and SAC meetings.

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)	Middle School 6-8
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	44%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	52	57	168
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	35	38	96
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	19	27	56
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	19	27	56
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	27	30	77
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	64	26	122
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	27	30	77
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	15	27	62

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	3	5	3	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	70	80	203
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	38	34	100
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	19	45
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	19	45
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	52	50	135
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	52	50	135
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	52	50	135

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	58	53	142

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	1	1	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	70	80	203
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	38	34	100
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	19	45
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	19	45
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	52	50	135
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	52	50	135
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	52	50	135

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	58	53	142

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	1	1	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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*	61	71	49	58	67	50	57		
ELA Learning Gains				48			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31			32		
Math Achievement*	67	79	56	60	37	36	57		
Math Learning Gains				56			45		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			35		
Science Achievement*	62	73	49	67	75	53	65		
Social Studies Achievement*		87	68	72	65	58	76		
Middle School Acceleration	73	68	73	66	51	49	71		
Graduation Rate					70	49			
College and Career Acceleration					90	70			
ELP Progress		49	40		71	76			

* 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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	263
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	500
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	4	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	30	Yes	4	1
HSP	72			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	51			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	3	1
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	3	
HSP	54			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	41			

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	61			67			62		73			
SWD	30			37			17		30		4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	91			91							2	
BLK	31			35			25				3	
HSP	63			69			63		92		4	
MUL	52			72							2	
PAC												
WHT	66			72			66		72		4	
FRL	48			52			39		63		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	58	48	31	60	56	42	67	72	66			
SWD	17	30	28	23	33	34	31	41	18			
ELL	29	42		33	44							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	35	23	24	35	27	38	71	20			
HSP	56	49	32	60	55	35	64	70	69			
MUL	50	44		50	40		67					
PAC												
WHT	63	51	37	67	60	48	73	74	70			
FRL	39	36	27	39	46	40	40	55	50			

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	57	51	32	57	45	35	65	76	71			
SWD	23	31	28	21	33	30	24	46				
ELL	33	33		57	42							
AMI												
ASN	70			80								
BLK	25	32	30	22	22	22	13	57				
HSP	52	52	21	63	52	31	45	77				
MUL	45	33		56	29							
PAC												
WHT	64	55	35	62	48	42	74	79	74			
FRL	37	37	29	38	35	32	41	51	41			

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
07	2023 - Spring	64%	69%	-5%	47%	17%
08	2023 - Spring	61%	69%	-8%	47%	14%
06	2023 - Spring	58%	70%	-12%	47%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	69%	81%	-12%	54%	15%
07	2023 - Spring	57%	66%	-9%	48%	9%
08	2023 - Spring	65%	81%	-16%	55%	10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	58%	71%	-13%	44%	14%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	78%	21%	50%	49%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	67%	33%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	86%	11%	63%	34%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	85%	-35%	66%	-16%

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.

The ELA lowest quartile showed the lowest Proficiency percentage, which includes many of our students with disabilities and students who are African American. This number was impacted by the fact that 6th Grade African American Students scored only a 15% proficiency rate as opposed to 24% the prior year. Many of these students are entering Middle School below grade level and report a lower level of belonging than other student groups.

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

Our 6th grade ELA proficiency score decreased by 1% overall however 6th grade student that are African American had proficiency rates that dropped 9%. The 8th grade African American students ELA proficiency score decreased by 6% to 32%. If you follow the same group of students from year to year you do see increases. 6th grade student had ELA proficiency rate of 59% in 21/22 and as 7th grader their proficiency rate increased to 64%. 7th graders had a 21/22 proficiency rate of 50% and as 8th graders showed an increase of 11% at 61% proficient.

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.

The ELA lowest quartile showed the lowest percentage, which includes many of our students with disabilities and students who are African American. Students are entering Middle School below grade level. The lowest quartile gains in ELA show some improvement but African American Student's rates are still below 41%.

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

The 6th grade math proficiency increased by 18%. A renewed focus on PLC's within the Math Department help that group focus on instructional strategies that pushed the team forward.

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

There are concerns about how many students in each grade level are level 1 on State testing in ELA or Math. Proficiency rates for both SWD and AA students in 6th and 8th grades are below 41%.

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

1. Close the achievement gap in ELA and math in our students with disabilities
2. Increase proficiency rates for Students who are African American to above 41%
3. Continue to build a strong Single School Culture with expanded use of PBIS
4. Develop a teacher retention model that will bring stability to classrooms year over year.

Area of Focus

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Students have shown gains but proficiency levels in both ELA and Math remain below 70% in all grade levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students will increase ELA proficiency rate to 70% or above in all grades.

Students will increase Math proficiency rate to 70% or above in all grades.

Monitoring:

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

FAST PM1, PM2, PM 3 and Final State Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Recia Smith (recia.smith@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.)

1. Identify and monitor students that need extra supports.
2. Professional Development will include coaching on instructional pedagogy for all students with a focus on those students caught in the Achievement Gap.
3. PLC Teams will Track data on formative and summative assessments and use the data to inform instructional strategy choices.
4. Develop mentor groups to address sense of belonging for students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To identify student needs and provide differentiated instruction using a variety of methods; such as grouping,

engagement strategies, project-based learning, remediation and enrichment.

Hattie's visible Learning shows that Effective feedback has a learning effect size of 0.90, and teaching strategies at 0.60.

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.

Identify students and their current level of achievement.

Person Responsible: Kirstie Gabaldon (kirstie.gabaldon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 15, 2023

Professional Development will include coaching on instructional pedagogy for students caught in the Achievement Gap.

Person Responsible: Recia Smith (recia.smith@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of first quarter.

Teachers will use the PLC model to monitor student progress using formative and summative assessments.

Person Responsible: Recia Smith (recia.smith@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

Leaders of Tomorrow - a leadership opportunity given to male students

Person Responsible: Darrin Tagliarini (darrin.tagliarini@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: By 10/1/2023 and weekly from there forward

Mentoring group for female students to include District Staff and members of the Community at large.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: By 10/1/2023 then monthly from there forward

#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.

Students with disabilities have not shown required proficiency levels based on state testing in ELA and Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We want to increase ELA proficiency levels for SWD to 45% in all grades.

We want to increase Math proficiency levels to 53% or above for SWD in all grades.

Monitoring:

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

FAST PM1, PM2, and Final State Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@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.)

1. Identify SWDs and their current level of achievement.
2. Schedule students in appropriate support facilitated course based on IEP and assign a case manager.
3. Collaboration between core teacher and ESE teacher for small group instruction - planning and delivery
4. In PLC's teachers will use formative & summative assessment to facilitate tracking of student progress

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. To identify student needs and provide differentiated instruction using a variety of methods, such as grouping, project based learning, remediation and enrichment.
2. Hattie's visible Learning shows that Effective feedback has a learning effect size of 0.90, and teaching strategies at 0.60, co-teaching at 0.19, class size at 0.21.

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.

Identify SWDs and their current level of achievement.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 9/15/2023

Schedule students in appropriate support facilitated course based on IEP and assign a case manager.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 8/25/2023

Collaboration between core teacher and ESE teacher for small group instruction - planning and delivery.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Started by 8/25/2023 then ongoing.

In PLC's teachers will use formative & summative assessment to facilitate tracking of student progress.

Person Responsible: Recia Smith (recia.smith@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of Quarter 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.

To cultivate a positive school culture through high expectations When clear expectations and positive relationships are present throughout a school, students and teachers are able to maintain an academic focus.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Out of school suspensions will decrease by 5% from last year.

Monitoring:

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

Core Discipline Data will be pulled weekly and brought to MTSS. Student appearing on the Core report will be discussed and interventions and supports will be added as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Hayes (kevin.hayes@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.)

1. We will utilize documents supporting a single school culture and explicitly teach expectations to students. These documents are accessible to faculty, parents, and students alike.
2. We will focus our PBS reward system on supporting single school culture expectations and character counts pillars.
3. Students will utilize planners as a "Passport" around school and to access rewards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Developing positive relationships is supported by Hattie's Visible Learning Research. Decreasing disruptive behavior in class has an effect size of .53 and teacher/student relationships has .73 effect size.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

We will develop and utilize documents supporting a single school culture and explicitly teach expectations to students. These documents are accessible to faculty, parents, and students alike.

Person Responsible: Kirstie Gabaldon (kirstie.gabaldon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 8/10/2023 and as needed

We will focus our PBS reward system on supporting single school culture expectations and character counts pillars.

Person Responsible: Darrin Tagliarini (darrin.tagliarini@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 9/1/2023

Students will utilize planners as a "Passport" around school and to access rewards.

Person Responsible: Kevin Hayes (kevin.hayes@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 8/23/2023

#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.

Data following new teachers shows that nearly 50% of all new teachers leave within the first 5 years of teaching. Creating a welcoming environment that promotes working relationships is crucial in ensuring teachers feel a sense of belonging to the school community. To reduce the turnover of first year at Sebastian teachers to below 25%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

To reduce the turnover of first year at Sebastian teachers to below 25%.

Monitoring:

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

Exit interviews will be used to monitor desired outcome and employment data will be pulled each May.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Hayes (kevin.hayes@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.)

1. New Teacher Cadre
2. New Teacher Mentor Program
3. Differentiation of PD for new and experienced teachers

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collective teacher efficacy has the largest effect size on student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Establish a New Teacher Cadre that will focus with a focus on “things to know” as a novice teacher and offer collaborative space for new teacher s to learn from each other.

Person Responsible: Darrin Tagliarini (darrin.tagliarini@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 10, 2023

Develop a formal new teacher mentor program that will allow for a more skilled or more experienced teacher will serve as a role model for novice teachers for the purpose of promoting the novice teacher's professional development.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 1, 2023, then monthly from there on.

Establish two tracks of Professional Development that will allow for differentiation for new and experienced teachers.

Person Responsible: Recia Smith (recia.smith@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 10/1/2023

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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.

African American Students have shown gains but proficiency levels in both ELA and Math remain below 41% in all grade levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students will increase ELA proficiency rate to 41% or above in all grades.

Students will increase Math proficiency rate to 41% or above in all grades.

Monitoring:

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

FAST PM1, PM2, PM 3 and Final State Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

1. Identify and monitor students that need extra supports.
2. Professional Development will include coaching on instructional pedagogy for all students with a focus on those students caught in the Achievement Gap.
3. PLC Teams will Track data on formative and summative assessments and use the data to inform instructional strategy choices.
4. Develop mentor groups to address sense of belonging for students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To identify student needs and provide differentiated instruction using a variety of methods; such as grouping, engagement strategies, project-based learning, remediation and enrichment. Hattie's visible Learning shows that Effective feedback has a learning effect size of 0.90, and teaching strategies at 0.60.

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.

Identify African American students who need improvement to achieve 41% proficiency in both ELA and Math.

Person Responsible: Kirstie Gabaldon (kirstie.gabaldon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 10/1/2023

Professional Development will include coaching on instructional pedagogy for students caught in the Achievement Gap.

Person Responsible: Recia Smith (recia.smith@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 10/1/2023

Create a service club for African American males to learn leadership skills throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Darrin Tagliarini (darrin.tagliarini@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 10/15/2023

Establish mentoring group for female African American students to include District Staff and members of the Community at large.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 10/31/2023

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

To narrow the achievement between English Language Learner (ELL) and schoolwide scores. The data indicates our ELL students are below the goal of 41% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We want to increase ELA proficiency levels for ELL's to 41% in all grades.

Monitoring:

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

FAST PM1, PM2, and Final State Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

1. Identify students in the subgroup
2. PD will focus on instructional strategies for ELL students.
3. ESOL Personnel will be brought on campus to support the subgroup
5. PLC Teams will track data and use the data to inform instructional practices

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Hattie's Visible Learning shows that teacher efficacy and effective feedback has a high effect size.

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.

Identify students in the subgroup

Person Responsible: Leanne Fortune (leanne.fortune@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 8/31/2023

Offer PD that will focus on instructional strategies for ELL students.

Person Responsible: Recia Smith (recia.smith@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 11/1/2023

ESOL Personnel will be brought on campus to support the subgroup

Person Responsible: Leanne Fortune (leanne.fortune@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 9/30/2023

PLC Teams will track data and use the data to inform instructional practices

Person Responsible: Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 10/1/2023 and then monthly

PLC Teams will track data and use the data to inform instructional practices

Person Responsible: Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: 10/1/2023 and then monthly

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).

To maximize likelihood of success, the improvement process should always begin with analyzing data to identify school based causes of underperformance. School leaders then can use that information to implement appropriate improvement strategies. Using the School Advisory Council process a team of stakeholders reviewed academic, behavioral and teacher retention data. Based on that review the school improvement goals were established. Further, the group used that data combined with the comprehensive needs assessment to determine funding allocation for the resources needed to reach our stated goals. Progress monitoring data will be used throughout the school year to continue to justify allocations on strategies that are working.