

St. Johns County School District

Switzerland Point Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Switzerland Point Middle School

777 GREENBRIAR RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-raider.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.

Switzerland Point Middle School strives to empower all students with a passion and curiosity for learning, as well as empathy for others. Each student's strengths, talents, and creative abilities will be recognized and nurtured.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to prepare EVERY student for high school, so that all opportunities are available for every child.

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
Carnall, Linda	Principal	Direct and manage instructional program and supervise operations and personnel at campus level. Provide leadership to ensure high standards of instructional service. Oversee compliance with district policies, success of instructional programs, and operation of all campus activities.
Wiggins, Sarah	Assistant Principal	Responsible for assisting the Principal with leadership, direction, supervision, operations and accountability.
Pillay, Alexandra	Assistant Principal	Responsible for assisting the Principal with leadership, direction, supervision, operations and accountability.
Benetsky, Kylie	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach is a highly qualified educator who is knowledgeable about curriculum and instruction and is able to increase student learning by fostering instructional excellence throughout the building. The coach will engage in the delivery of professional development, including observing teachers, coaching and modeling instructional and assessment strategies, and providing feedback that ensures effective instruction and student learning.
Gibian, Kelly	Dean	The Dean promotes positive behavior expectations throughout the school and administers student discipline consequences in accordance with the district's disciplinary policy.
Tippins, Jennifer	School Counselor	Monitor student grades and attendance, gather teacher feedback, facilitate parent meetings and support student needs.
Patterson, Caryn	School Counselor	Monitor student grades and attendance, gather teacher feedback, facilitate parent meetings and support student needs.
Parks, Lynda	School Counselor	Monitor student grades and attendance, gather teacher feedback, facilitate parent meetings and support student needs.
Saenz, Kiersten	Dean	The Dean promotes positive behavior expectations throughout the school and administers student discipline consequences in accordance with the district's disciplinary policy.

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.

The School Advisory Council presents stakeholders with surveys each year. The survey information is used to inform administration regarding possible changes to the SIP.

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 by the Leadership Team, SAC, and our MTSS core team. Changes will be made based on discussions in the teams listed.

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	27%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	5%
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)* 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	71	89	222
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	47	53	136
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	49	70	156
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	35	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	31	41	58	130

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	2	2	7
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	83	53	61	197
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	44	39	120
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	47	43	121
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	15	20	68
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	26	26	89

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	53	61	197
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	44	39	120
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	47	43	121
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	15	20	68
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	26	26	89

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	2	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	74	71	49	70	67	50	72		
ELA Learning Gains				53			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			42		
Math Achievement*	85	79	56	80	37	36	80		
Math Learning Gains				67			65		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61			55		
Science Achievement*	74	73	49	75	75	53	70		
Social Studies Achievement*	92	87	68	92	65	58	89		
Middle School Acceleration	67	68	73	76	51	49	64		
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	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	615
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	37	Yes	2	
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	65			
HSP	62			
MUL	82			
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	61			

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	40	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	59			
HSP	62			
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	68			
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	74			85			74	92	67			
SWD	33			57			38		19		4	
ELL	56			78							2	
AMI												
ASN	84			95			76		92		4	
BLK	58			81			57				3	
HSP	67			73			63		46		4	
MUL	77			88			74		87		4	
PAC												
WHT	75			87			77	93	67		5	
FRL	58			76			54		56		4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	70	53	41	80	67	61	75	92	76			
SWD	27	37	34	40	51	51	34	61	28			
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	84	71	64	93	79		94	97	88			
BLK	53	45	30	62	62	65	58	100				
HSP	59	51	40	72	63	58	67	79	67			
MUL	69	58		86	76	77	71	100	78			
PAC												
WHT	71	52	41	81	67	60	75	93	76			
FRL	49	34	29	56	47	36	59	73	40			

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	72	58	42	80	65	55	70	89	64			
SWD	33	39	35	50	57	48	29	66	14			
ELL	33	50		67	75							
AMI												
ASN	86	77	60	91	78	67	90	96	84			
BLK	49	48	27	58	50	36	27	42				
HSP	60	51	46	76	68	61	50	88	52			
MUL	66	55		76	67	70	58	88				
PAC												
WHT	74	57	40	81	64	54	73	90	64			
FRL	57	48	33	59	64	50	67	77	40			

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	72%	69%	3%	47%	25%
08	2023 - Spring	67%	69%	-2%	47%	20%
06	2023 - Spring	76%	70%	6%	47%	29%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	89%	81%	8%	54%	35%
07	2023 - Spring	77%	66%	11%	48%	29%
08	2023 - Spring	86%	81%	5%	55%	31%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	70%	71%	-1%	44%	26%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	78%	20%	50%	48%

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	99%	86%	13%	63%	36%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	85%	8%	66%	27%

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.

Across all subgroups, except for the black subgroup, ELA proficiency declined. The Black subgroup made gains in all categories except in ELA learning gains. SWD achievement and LG in both math and ELA dropped. Science achievement increased across subgroups except for FRL. Social Studies overall achievement increased. Middle school acceleration increased except for the FRL subgroup. The SWD subgroup dropped in all categories except science achievement and middle school acceleration, in which they increased.

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

SWD would be our greatest gap and could be attributed to teacher turnover and the need for more targeted professional development.

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.

SWD would be our greatest gap and could be attributed to teacher turnover and the need for more targeted professional development.

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

Our black subgroup showed the most improvement. This was likely caused by building good relationships with students to foster learning in the classroom.

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

Absences and ISS/OSS are the areas of concern.

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

Improvement in ELA proficiency, teacher retention, small group work, classroom walkthroughs and feedback, and improvement in our SWD subgroup across the board are our highest priorities.

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 Small Group Instruction**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.

Looking at our data trends across all grades and subgroups, we are focusing on purposeful small group instruction to increase student success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SPMS will see an increase in ELA proficiency in all grade levels by 2% as compared with prior year data.

Monitoring:

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

SPMS will have monthly Professional Learning focused on purposeful small group instruction that will be monitored through PLT meetings, data review, and classroom observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@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 will hold monthly Professional Learning sessions on small group instruction and monitor student data through the PLT process and MTSS. SPMS will also use the Lexia reading program for all students and the QRI -6 for SWD and Rtl students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing professional learning and PLT support, we will increase student achievement. Collective teacher efficacy is the number one factor to influence 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.

Provide monthly Professional Learning on purposeful small group instruction

Person Responsible: Kylie Benetsky (kylie.benetsky@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: The 2nd Wednesday of each month

Monitor small group work in classes and planning in PLTs

Person Responsible: Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the year

#2. 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.

In looking at the data of teachers that were hired, in addition to those who chose to leave SPMS over the last year, as well as qualitative information from conversations with teachers, there is a need for increased support for teachers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teacher retention will increase for the end of the school year by 50% as compared with the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators will do check-ins with new teachers to see what additional supports are needed. The ILC and Math Coach will visit new teacher classrooms to assist. The district mentor will provide additional support, as will the New Teacher Cadre.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@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.)

SPMS will provide professional development and mentors to new teachers to increase teacher retention. A new teacher orientation will be held to acclimate new teachers prior to the start of school and to provide them with the necessary information to beginning of the school year. Teachers may have a coaching cycle with the ILC, time to work with CAST members, or time to observe other veteran teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing resources, professional development, and mentorship, new teachers will be able to be successful in their craft and continue at SPMS for the next year.

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.

Hold new teacher orientation

Person Responsible: Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Prior to August 10

Provide new teachers with a mentor

Person Responsible: Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Prior to August 10

Provide new teachers the opportunity to observe other teachers and enter into a coaching cycle with the ILC

Person Responsible: Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the year, prior to May 25

Meet with and monitor new teachers for needs and supports

Person Responsible: Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the year, prior to May 25

#3. 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.

ESSA subgroup data of SPMS SWD indicate a critical discrepancy between SWD and their general education peers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SPMS SWD subgroup will increase 10% in total points to achieve at least 50% total points for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

SWD progress on standards will be monitored through common formative and summative assessments by teachers. Case managers will monitor progress on goals with the assistance for teacher and administrators. FAST Progress monitoring data will be used also to inform instruction and goals. Student data will be monitored through the MTSS team. SWD will be monitored for reading with the QRI-6/Lexia and IXL for math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@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.)

PLTs will operate in a collaborative structure, collecting data and creating standards-based lessons to increase student achievement. PLTs will create lessons based on data to facilitate small group instruction and intervention. SWD students will participate in Unique Skills for reading, based on their specific needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PLTs will operate in a collaborative structure, collecting data and creating standards-based lessons to increase student achievement. The Guiding Coalition will provide support to the PLTs. Collective teacher efficacy is the number one factor to influence 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.

Assign case managers to monitor the implementation of the IEP goals and progress

Person Responsible: Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Prior to August 10

MTSS and Administrative team to monitor student's PM data and put supports in place for student success

Person Responsible: Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the year, prior to May 25

Provide tutoring after school for SWD

Person Responsible: Kylie Benetsky (kylie.benetsky@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Prior to May 25

#4. 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.

In order to increase teacher retention, we will focus on being present in teacher classrooms to provide valuable feedback to teachers to improve instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SPMS Administrators will visit 5 classrooms each a week with 2 out of 5 being teachers within the first 3 years of teaching or those new to SPMS.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators and coaches will meet weekly to discuss what teachers were visited and if additional supports, resources, or professional learning are needed for the teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@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.)

From walkthroughs, administrators will determine what professional learning needs to occur for both the whole school and individual teachers. Administrators will also determine the need for coaching cycles, observations of veteran teachers, working with CAST, or topics for the New Teacher Cadre.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Administrators will complete walkthroughs and provide feedback to increase teacher efficacy and retention.

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.

Visit classrooms and use the observation tool

Person Responsible: Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the year, prior to May 25

Meet as an administrative team to discuss teachers' needs based on observations and plan targeted PD to support their growth

Person Responsible: Linda Carnall (linda.carnall@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the year, prior to May 25

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).

We will review the SIP with the SAC committee each time a funding request is submitted and ensure then we are voting to have the funds allocated to align with our school improvement goals.